1901

Raymond Vermont

Denton Texas

The Book not borrowed for ordinary

THE

CELEBRATED

Controversial Discussion

BETWEEN

THE REV. THOMAS MAGUIRE

AND

THE REV. RICHARD T. P. POPE,

WHICH TOOK PLACE AT THE

LECTURE-ROOM OF THE DUBLIN INSTITUTION,

WHERE O'CONNELL AND OTHERS PRESIDED.

A FULL, COMPLETE, AND AUTHENTIC REPORT.

ALMA COLLEGE
218
LIBRARY
Mc 179
Alma, California

P. J. KENEDY,
EXCELSIOR CATHOLIC PUBLISHING HOUSE.
5 BARCLAY STREET,
1895.

11977

Copyright,
D. & J. SADLIER & CO.,
1885.

INTRODUCTION.

As introductory to the Report of the important Controversial Discussion between the Rev. Messrs. Pope and Maguire, we feel it our duty to lay before the Public the arrangements which preceded the meetings for the above object.

A meeting was held on Wednesday, the 11th of April, 1827, at the house of Mr. Tims, in Grafton street, at which Messrs. Pope and Maguire were present; when it was resolved, that as the points about to be discussed equally affected the Protestant and Roman Catholic Churches, so there should be an equality in every particular, in order that the public, on the after consideration, might be satisfied that the Discussion had been conducted in the most impartial manner, and entered upon with the spirit of kindness and mutual good feeling.

After several meetings, in which we have the gratification to say, every disposition was evinced on both sides to act with liberality and candor, while at the same time principle was upheld with uncompromising steadiness, the Reverend Gentlemen having finally settled the points for discussion, and the undersigned definitely and with their entire approbation, having arranged the preliminaries, the day of meeting was fixed for the 19th day of April. From the impossibility of procuring the Rotunda for six successive days, (the shortest time the discussion could last,) and no more spacious or equally commodious place for meeting presenting itself, the Lecture-room of the Dublin Institution, Sackville street, was taken; and in the result manifested that, as to situation, necessity had compelled, what judgment ultimately approved

The preliminaries entered into were as follows.

I.

Arrangement agreed upon for the proposed discussion between the Rev. Mr. Pope and the Rev. Mr. Maguire, April 12, 1827.

I. The Discussion to commence on Thursday, the 19th instant, and continue from day to day until closed.

II. The Meetings to be presided over by two Chairmen one Protestant and one Roman Catholic.

III. The business to commence each day at eleven o'clock, to close at three, with the exception of the first day, which will close at four o'clock.

IV. The Discussion to be limited to three points by each party, viz:

MR. POPE.

1st, Infallibility; 2d, Purgatory; 3d, Transubstantiation.

MR. MAGUIRE.

1st, The divine right of private judgment to *pronounce* upon the *authenticity*, *integrity*, and *canonicity*, of Scripture, and to determine its meaning in articles of faith.

2d, The justification of the Reformation.

3d, The Protestant Churches do not possess that *unity* which forms the distinctive mark of the true Church of Christ.

V. The points to be discussed in the following order:

1st day,	- - -	Mr. Pope, 1st point.
2d do.	- - -	Mr. Maguire, do.
3d do.	- - -	Mr. Pope, 2d point.
4th do.	- - -	Mr. Maguire, do.
5th do.	- - -	Mr. Pope, 3d point.
6th do.	- - -	Mr. Maguire, do.

VI. Not more than one point to be spoken to at a time.

VII. No new point to be spoken to by either party, until the point under consideration is *fully* and *finally* closed.

VIII. The speeches and replies to be limited to half an hour and each point to occupy but one day at the utmost.

N. B. The number of minutes which may be lost before the beginning of each day's discussion, to be added to the period of closing the business of the day.

IX. Admission to be by tickets only, for which shall be charged the sum of , the surplus of money so collected, after defraying all the expenses attending the Discussion, to be handed over to the Mendicity.

X. The Meeting to be open to the Press, but a special Reporter for each party to be employed, who shall be responsible

for the accuracy of the reports that shall be made of the speeches and entire business of the discussion.*

XI. Two door-keepers to be provided, one Roman Catholic and one Protestant.

XII. No indication to be admitted of approbation or disapprobation.

XIII. The authorised copy of the speeches to be authenticated by the signatures of the Rev. Mr. Pope, and Rev. Mr. Maguire

T. MAGUIRE, P. Æ. SINGER,
RICHARD T. P. POPE, JOHN LAWLESS.

II.

Further Preliminary Regulations for the Proceedings of the Meeting of the Rev. Mr. Pope, and Rev. Mr. Maguire, agreed to by the undersigned, on the part of the above Gentlemen respectively.

I. No person whatever to be permitted to address the meeting but the Rev. Mr. Pope, and Rev. Mr. Maguire.

II. No part of the auditory to interfere in any way whatever with the Rev. Gentlemen above named, or with the subject matter of the discussion.

III. The undersigned to be at liberty to explain any part of the preliminary arrangements, if called upon to do so from the Chair.

IV. The Chairmen are requested to prevent any manifestation of approbation or disapprobation, and to enforce perfect silence in the meeting.

P. Æ. SINGER,
Dublin, 18*th April*, 1827. JOHN LAWLESS.

III.

Further Articles of Agreement entered into by the undersigned, on the part of Messrs. Pope and Maguire.

I. The parties not to exceed four speeches each during any one day. Merely calling on the opposite party for proofs not to be considered as a speech.

II. Declining to speak in turn by either party, when it is his rotation, or speaking short of the limited period of half an hour, to be considered as one of the four speeches of the day.

III. The business of each day to close after each party has spoken, or has the opportunity of speaking *four* times, although it should not have reached the hour of three o'clock; it being hereby again declared that agreeably to the regulations of the 12th instant, should the discussion reach three o'clock, the number of minutes which may have elapsed after eleven o'clock, (the hour fixed for commencing the discussion on each day)

* The Special Reporters appointed on this occasion were Mr. P. D. HARDY and Mr. J. SHERIDAN.

shal. be added to the time allotted to the last speaker, on each day, so as to complete his half hour, should he desire to continue for that time, although such addition shall exceed three o'clock by so many minutes.

P. Æ. SINGER,
JOHN LAWLESS.

20th April, 1827.

The chairs having been taken, on the morning of the 19th of April by ADMIRAL OLIVER, as the Protestant, and DANIEL O'CONNELL, ESQ, as the Roman Catholic Chairman, the latter briefly observed, "That he considered it necessary to state, that the Gentlemen who had been appointed to make the preliminary arrangements would read the particular rules by which the meeting was to be governed; and as he felt assured that the mere reading of the rules would be quite sufficient to induce every gentleman to comply with them, he would not make any further observations."

The friend appointed by Mr. Pope having been then called upon, the document No. 2, was read, as containing the rules immediately relating to the meeting.

The undersigned, in making the foregoing statement, have discharged a duty which they felt to be incumbent upon them; and they have to express their gratification, that so important a discussion, and one so likely to excite the mind beyond the exact limits of discretion, was conducted with becoming zeal, but at the same time with good feeling, and a conduct suited to the momentous business in hand. They are also equally gratified, that the arrangements which they entered into, were such as to give satisfaction to the auditory, and ensure that regularity and silence which became the solemnity of the occasion.

P. Æ. SINGER,
JOHN LAWLESS.

I certify that the Report of the recent Discussion between Mr. Pope and myself, as published by Messrs. Coyne, Tims, & Curry, is alone authentic, each proof sheet having received my signature.

June 14, 1827. THOMAS MAGUIRE.

PHILIP DIXON HARDY,
JAMES SHERIDAN.

I certify that the Report of the recent Discussion between Mr. Maguire and myself, as published by Messrs. Coyne, Tims, & Curry, is alone authentic, each proof sheet having received my signature.

June 14, 1827. RICHARD T P. POPE.

JAMES SHERIDAN,
PHILIP DIXON HARDY.

CONTROVERSIAL DISCUSSION

First Day.—April 19, 1827.

SUBJECT.—*The Infallibility of the Roman Catholic Church.*

The Chair having been taken by Admiral Oliver and Mr O'Connell, and the particular rules, by which the discussion was to be governed, read by Mr. Singer.

The Rev. Mr. Pope rose, and said—Gentlemen, I need scarcely remark, that we are assembled here this day, for the discussion of the most important subjects which can possibly engage the human mind. We are not assembled to debate a question relative to the politics of this passing scene—we have not come here for the purpose of discussing matters which concern us merely as the inhabitants of this lower world; but to debate topics of the most vital consequence to us as immortal and accountable beings. Let us then, in entering on this momentous discussion, divest ourselves of every party feeling, and come to the consideration of the subject before us with minds unbiassed and unprejudiced. And here it may not be uninteresting to this meeting to be put in possession of the circumstances which led to the present discussion. While in Longford, in November last, I received a letter from an individual, (whom I afterwards discovered to be a Roman Catholic of no inconsiderable information) in which it was stated, that I was challenged by a Roman Catholic Clergyman to meet him in public, for the purpose of discussing the points of difference between the Protestant and the Roman Catholic churches; and that I had then a fair opportunity of defending the principles which I maintained, and of exposing in the face of the world, the errors of the church of Rome, if any such errors existed. I considered it judicious to wait, until the challenge should reach me in an authentic form. In a day or two afterwards, I saw in the *Weekly Register*, of the 23d November, an account of an Aggregate Meeting at Carrick-on-Shannon, and which contained a speech made by the Rev. Mr. Maguire, in which was the following passage:—

"Let the advocates of such a system, the Wolffes and the Popes of the day, bring the matter to an issue, and I challenge Wolffe or Pope to meet me and answer the question of the Socinian, and prove from the principles of private judgment that he is wrong; or if they be able to answer the question in any way but that in which the Catholic church answers it, I will myself become a Biblical, and go through the country on the same mission as they are on—but they will not, they cannot."

At a meeting of the Hibernian Society, which took place on the following Tuesday, I commented on the Socinian question, expressed my willingness to meet Mr. Maguire, and requested that, if there were any Roman Catholics at the meeting, they would convey my answer to Mr. Maguire. Fearing, however, that my observations might escape his notice, and being anxious that he should not be ignorant of my readiness to meet him, I addressed a letter to the Editor of the *Roscommon and Leitrim Gazette*, which, after treating on the subject of the Socinian controversy, concludes thus:—"And now, Sir, in conclusion, I beg leave to state, that I am ready to discuss the subject of this letter, or the Roman Catholic controversy generally, with Mr. Maguire, or any other gentleman, believing that "magna est veritas et prævalebit."

Such, then, gentlemen, was my acceptance of what I conceived to be a challenge from Mr. Maguire. Some time after, a letter appeared in the *Weekly Register*, from Mr. Maguire, in which he gives the following report of a part of his speech at Carrick-on-Shannon:—"I there observed," he says, "that in flippancy of tongue, tortuosity of mind, and sophistry of argument, the Bible-men stood unrivalled; but that were I to meet the arch-crusader on the arena of polemical disputation, (and this handsome compliment I intended for you) I would confine him to a few solid, stubborn objections, of which, if he gave a clear logical solution, I myself would become a Biblical, and raise my feeble voice in the loud, holy, profitable cry." Towards the conclusion of this letter, he grounds a proposal upon a concession which I could never grant, namely, "That the objection of the Socinian remains unanswered and unanswerable, (the principle and practice of private interpretation alone considered)." His proposal was as follows:—"Should you have the manliness to make this necessary admission, which I must insist upon as a *sine qua non*, I shall afford you ampler canvass, and a rougher sea, viz: of all the charges which have been, and now can be advanced against the doctrines of the Roman Catholic church, you shall be at liberty to select whatever three you deem most glaring and untenable, whilst I, in my turn, shall bring three prime charges against the doctrines of your church, and

thus we shall be both plaintiff and defendant reciprocally." In my next letter to Mr. Maguire, I observed, "It is apparent from your own report, that you either did not challenge me, or that you have retracted the challenge; the expression 'were I to meet the arch-crusader,' conveying most undoubtedly a very different meaning from that contained in the words, 'I challenge Wolffe or Pope to meet me,' ascribed to you in the *Register*. I here distinctly call upon you either publicly to confess that you did not challenge me, or to meet me for public discussion, 'Utrum horum mavis accipe.' I write strongly, but not in the spirit of polemical bravado." I shall now read to you the concluding paragraph of Mr. Maguire's last letter. "I do declare, distinctly, that I never did invite you to a *viva voce* disputation;—and I as distinctly declare, that I now accept your challenge and will meet you at the Rotunda, in Dublin." He says, he never did challenge me—you, gentlemen, will judge, whether I had not reason to consider his speech reported in the *Register*, as containing a challenge. I again wrote to Mr. Maguire, and the result of that correspondence has been, that after an amicable arrangement of preliminaries, we are met here this day to discuss the various subjects which have been agreed upon; and I most willingly bear testimony to the good feeling which has been evinced by my reverend opponent and his friend.

Permit me to say, gentlemen, that we should hail the appearance of Mr. Maguire amongst us this day, as exhibiting a noble display of independent feeling and judgment. I say, it is a noble display of independent feeling—it is manly and bold in Mr. Maguire to appear here to advocate his principles; especially as it is well known that the Roman Catholic Primate of Ireland has publicly expressed his disapprobation of such a proceeding. I say, then, it is manly and bold in him, circumstanced as he is, thus to come forward and claim his privilege, as an intellectual and rational being, of thinking and acting for himself. The present meeting is certainly one of a very peculiar character, and will doubtless be regarded as a memorable event in the history of this country. We have on the one hand Dr. Curtis, the Titular Primate, expressing his disapprobation of the proceedings; but, on the other hand, has the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Dublin interfered to prevent Mr. Maguire from attending here this day? or has the Roman Catholic Bishop of Mr. Maguire's diocess (Kilmore) taken any notice whatever of the extraordinary circumstance of one of the Clergy disobeying the wishes of the Titular Primate? Gentlemen, it appears, that neither the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Dublin, nor the Roman Catholic Bishop of Kilmore has interposed their authority in the business. And I do say that by their silence on

the subject they have given an indirect sanction to the proceeding; for they possess the power of preventing Mr. Maguire from attending, and that power they have not exercised. I believe, I am right, in stating that there are some Roman Catholic Clergymen here this day. I hail their presence amongst us with great satisfaction, as, in my mind, by their attendance, they also give their sanction to the proceedings. With respect to the preliminaries, I have one observation to make—it regards myself—it is thought by some, that I possess a talent for declamatory speaking. Supposing this to be the case, I am by the arrangements which have been entered into, relative to the mode in which the discussion is to be conducted, precluded from availing myself of any advantage which this talent, if I possess it, might give me—as it has been agreed upon that neither my reverend opponent nor myself shall be allowed to address the meeting for longer than half an hour at a time—my soarings must be contracted—my pinions must be fettered down. It is not by flights of fancy or poetical allusions that this meeting is to be swayed—argument is the only weapon that can be wielded here this day. We must be governed by the only unerring standard,—the word of God. One word to the gentlemen of the public Press—all I ask is justice—justice alike to each of us—let our principles and opinions go fairly before the world—let the world scrutinize and examine them, and then give its verdict—I shall not at present occupy more of your time.

Mr. MAGUIRE rose, and spoke to the following effect:—Gentlemen—As my friend, Mr. Pope, has entered into a very long narrative, touching the circumstances that have led to the present discussion, it will not be considered egotism in me, if I give you a brief sketch of them, as far as they regard myself. I happened, last November, to come to the town of Carrick-on-Shannon, on private business of importance, and I solemnly assure you, that I was not aware, until I arrived in Carrick, that a meeting of the Catholics of Leitrim was about to be held there I was pressed by a few particular friends to remain for the meeting which was fixed for the next day; and on attending at the meeting, a resolution on the subject of education was put into my hands to move. In doing so, I prefaced it with a few observations, and I distinctly recollect saying, that my great objection to the disputations upon the indiscriminate circulation of the Scriptures was, that they all ended in a wordy war, and miserable speechifying. I objected to that course, and I said, that on the contrary, solid argument, logical deduction, and close fighting should be adopted. I went on to say, that such was the course I was determined to pursue; and that *were* I (you will

observe that my expression was an hypothetical one, to meet the arch-crusader himself, in the arena of polemical disputation, instead of suffering him to indulge in flights of fancy, which would only obscure, or in strains of eloquence that would only confuse I would confine him to a few solid objections, such as that respecting the Socinian, which, if he would satisfactorily solve to me, I would myself consent to become a Biblical. You will observe that my expression was put hypothetically. I did not say that I *would* meet him, but that *were* I to meet him, I would avoid the flights of fancy and speechifying, and confine him to a few solid objections. A report of the observations which I made at this meeting appeared in the *Weekly Register*, and I was there made to say that I was ready to meet the Popes, &c, &c. I can assure this assembly, that no such expression as that fell from me on that occasion. A newspaper controversy, the necessary consequence of a misrepresentation on the part of Mr. Pope, ensued. Mr. Pope addressed a long letter to me, through the columns of the *Evening Mail*. In that letter he attempted to solve the objection with regard to the Socinian. I replied, to show that he had not solved that question; and I trust, before this polemical conflict is over, to prove to you that he has not solved it, and that he never will. With regard to what he has said about the Roman Catholic Primate of Ireland, it would have been more dignified in Mr. Pope to be silen on that point.—I avoided hearing or seeing any thing from my own Bishop, Dr. O'Reilly. Since I came to Dublin, I have not received any communication from him, verbal or written.—If I have thus come forward in this public place, and on this solemn occasion, I have not done so until I have been repeatedly challenged to the conflict. A number of persons were hired, I know not by whom, and sent round my parish with green bags containing copies of the challenge, which they circulated most industriously in every possible direction. The challenge was put into every cabin, it was posted upon every wall in the county. I state these circumstances to you, as they will form with you some excuse for the appearance here this day of a man who has lived amidst the bogs of Leitrim—a man who has been the inhabitant of the mountains, and who never before addressed an enlightened audience like the present. It must appear to you from this relation of facts, that it was no overweening desire of notoriety that pressed me forward. Over me Dr. Curtis and Dr Murray exercise no direct control; and I trust that, in holding a conversation in this public room, I do not involve myself in a breach of clerical jurisdiction. I am well aware that the Roman Catholic Bishops of Ireland never will recognize the principle of public discussions upon matters of religion in this

rountry--disturbed as it is by moral, polemical, and political differences and conflicts. I disclaim, I deny, with uplifted arms, any thing like an indirect sanction of these proceedings on the part of the Catholic Prelates as mentioned by Mr. Pope. I stand forward here, of myself, to defend my religious principles, which have grown with my growth, and for the assertion of which I am ready if called upon, to lay down my life. These principles I am determined to maintain, unless indeed Mr. Pope shall convince me that I am in error. If I be convinced that I am in error, I am ready to change my religious opinions, and to adopt whatever creed reason might in that case point out as preferable to my own. Having stated so much with respect to the challenge, I have a few words to say with respect to Dr. Curtis. It may not be inappropriate here to remark, that though I am independent of the control of Dr. Curtis, the Roman Catholic Primate of all Ireland, I am ready to listen to any advice emanating from him, with respect and dutiful attention. I am well aware that obedience is one of the great and principal duties of the Christian—I know, as the Apostle has it, that he who refuses to obey the authorities set over him by Divine Providence resisteth the ordinances of God, and procureth to himself damnation. I would not, therefore, disobey my superiors, as, in doing so, I would be guilty of a violation of moral principle. It may not be out of place for me to mention to you the personal disadvantages under which I labor on the present occasion. Mr. Pope is an old practitioner in the business of disputation. He has become, by habit, eloquent on the subject, and he has a fatal facility of expressing himself, sufficient to make any cause in his hands appear plausible. His system has all the charms of novelty to recommend it—and fashion, we all know, is a formidable temptation. He has arrayed in his favor worldly power and influence. He has, besides, all the saints and sinners o modern times, whose pride and self-interest will secure him attentive ears. He knows how to estimate the value of such influence. I do not mean to say that it has any weight with him in the assertion of his religious principles. I solemnly declare that I give him credit for sincerity. But I have one complaint, and a serious one, to make against him. He has left me little or no ground for attack. I could not obtain from Mr. Pope, without difficulty, a profession of his creed. When called upon to define his faith, he has called himself a Protestant. Mr. Pope protests against the church of England—so do I. He protests against the church of Scotland—so do I. Against the church in Germany—so do I. Against the Greek church—so do I. Mr. Pope, in fact protests against every church, but, in a more especial and particular manner, does he protest against the

"errors" of Popery; and if any errors do exist in Popery, I am ready to protest as strongly against them as Mr. Pope. So far I am equally a Protestant with Mr. Pope, and my Protestantism goes as far as his, consisting, as it does, in a simple negation of Popery, if it be understood in the sense in which Mr. Pope would exhibit it. On the other hand, Mr. Pope has the whole range of Roman Catholicism, whence to select three favorite charges against my known and established principles. Where are the points which I am to select against him? In the confession of faith which he made to me, he admitted the doctrines of the Trinity, the Incarnation and Justification, by Faith ONLY. Now there is not one of those principles which I do not admit except the word "only." So far it is difficult for me to select three principal charges against him. It is true that Mr. Pope has volunteered to defend two points which he does not entirely and undoubtedly believe, but which he has the kindness to support against me. I have a few preliminary observations to offer to you regarding the scriptural proofs of the existence of an infallible church. Mr. Pope is not the advocate of any church. I avow myself the child and champion of an infallible church. It remains for you to see whether the motives of credibility which attach me to that church are defensible—it remains for you to judge whether the doctrine, that Christ established a church upon earth, and endowed it with infallibility, be grounded upon scripture—be consistent with the primitive faith of Christianity—be agreeable to common reason and common sense. It is easy to perceive, that he who denies the necessity of bending to a spiritual authority, is establishing a principle latitudinarian and revolutionary in the strictest sense of the words. If there exist no spiritual authority upon earth, to which man is to yield obedience, I assert that every act of rebellion against the church and against the state is the admitted and unqualified right of every individual. If the principle of private judgment be founded upon the law of nature, or upon the positive law of God, there can be no limitation of the right. The law has made no exception, consequently every individual has a right (and there is no exception, either in religious or political matters) to set up his private judgment against the laws of the church and of the community. It was such principles that caused the revolution in England, and brought a king to the block. To similar principles we are to attribute the bloody scenes of the desolating revolution in France. Such principles have involved Germany in the darkest Atheism. I hold in my hand the work of the Rev. Mr. Rose, dedicated to the Bishop of Chester, in which he laments the state of the churches in Germany, with the pathos of a Jeremy—he describes them as plunged in the darkest

Atheism. Every thing in the scripture is explained away there, and the test of natural philosophy is absurdly applied to the miracles of our Redeemer. If the principle of private judgment be once recognized, then had the heretics of former days, Arius, Cerinthus, Manicheus, &c, as good a right to the exercise of private judgment as Mr. Pope, or any gentleman of the 19th century. If those heretics had a right to exercise it, upon what principle did the Catholic church condemn them—cut them off as rotten members, and treat them, as Christ said those shall be treated who would not hear the church, as heathens and publicans, and reprobates upon the earth? Mr. Pope, I suppose, recognizes the first four councils, and the Athanasian creed—he must then admit that the church had a right to condemn Arius, Eutyches, and Manicheus, and every other heretic and heresy that appeared for the first four centuries of the Christian æra. If he acknowledged the power in the church to condemn heresy in the first century, why not acknowledge it now? Gentlemen, I am about to enter upon my proofs of the authority of the Catholic church. Mr. Pope's rules of faith will be amply discussed hereafter, but now you are about to hear, what, to some of you may appear the antiquated doctrine of church authority, which has been discarded by modern Reformers for the last 300 years.

Mr. Pope.—I beg to call upon Mr. Maguire for proofs of the Infallibility of the Church of Rome.

Mr. Maguire.—I shall make a few preliminary observations before I directly enter upon the subject. If the unlimited right of private judgment be recognised, then will a seven-fold shield be thrown over every error, however impure—every heresy, however damnable—every folly, however ridiculous. It will be the origin of every species of madness, violence, and fanaticism. What will each of the heretics say? "I exercise my judgment conscientiously and to the best of my ability—I have prayed to God that he might enlighten me with his grace. I have taken every means in my power to arrive at the truth, and my decided conviction now is that Christ is not the Son of God." Thus would Arianism, that heresy which distracted the church of Christ, and which, if the protecting influence of the Almighty had not been extended to his church, would have eradicated every Christian principle, and sapped the foundation of that heavenly and noble edifice, become justifiable. How could Mr. Pope blame the Arian? Mr. Pope would appeal to the scriptures—but in vain he would appeal to the scriptures against the obstinate Arian or Socinian. They would in reply appeal to their conscience—they will say that they have read

the scriptures, and that they have as good a right to interpret their meaning as Mr Pope. Can Mr. Pope, who recognizes the principle of gospel liberty, blame them for their conduct? Will he, in this regard, violate that principle which is the boast of the Reformation? Who is to judge between Mr. Pope and the Socinian or Arian? God alone can be their judge, and that not till the soul is separated from the body. Mr. Pope has called upon me for proofs of the infallibility of the church of Rome. I beseech you, gentlemen, for the tender mercies of God, as far as in you lies, to divest yourselves of every feeling, of every prejudice, of every prepossession in favor of your own opinions that have been dear to you, and to weigh in the honest balance of sincerity the principles which I shall lay down, and which I shall invariably found upon texts of scripture, and upon the authority established in the church for the first five ages of Christianity. I assure you I do hope, with the blessing of heaven, and by the influence of the Holy Ghost, to make some converts. I am serious, believe me. Protestants are not in the habit of examining the Roman Catholic religion. The very name of Popery is sufficient to frighten them—the basilisk does not appear half so dangerous in their eyes as Popery. And for my part I should not wonder at their thinking so, if Popery really were what they have been taught to believe it is. It is incumbent on you then to commence an examination of the tenets of the Roman Catholic religion. The first text to which I shall refer you, is taken from *Isaiah*, lix, 21. It is admitted by Protestants, that the inspired writer in this passage spoke of the church that was to come.

"This is my covenant with them, saith the Lord; my spirit that is in thee, and my words that I have put into thy mouth, shall not depart out of thy mouth, nor out of the mouth of thy seed, nor out of the mouth of thy seed's seed, saith the Lord, from henceforth and for ever."

But I need not dwell at length upon this text, as I am furnished with several strong and conclusive texts in the New Testament.

"As the Father has sent me, I also send you," says the Lord, addressing his Apostles. Again—"All power is given to me in heaven and in earth; go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and lo! I am with you all days even to the consummation of the world."—*Matthew*, xxviii, 18, 19, 20.

Christ here declares, that the same power given to him by the Father he communicates to his Apostles without limitation, moral or personal. It is a maxim in ethics, *Ubi lex non distinguit, nec nos distinguere debemus.* The Father conferred upon Christ infallibility, and here he directly communicates all his power to the Apostles. Perhaps it will be said, that it

rested there, and was to cease with the lives of the Apostles Christ declares the contra y, for he adds,

"Lo! I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world."

Were the Apostles to live for ever, or rather was not this power to be communicated to their representatives on earth in whose persons they would morally live for ever? St. Paul writing to Timothy says,

"The church of the living God, is the pillar and the ground of truth."—iii. 15.

Again, our Saviour says,

"He that heareth you, heareth me, and he that despiseth you, despiseth me, and he that despiseth me, despiseth Him that sent me."—*Luke* x, 16.

Also St. John, iv, 6.

"He that knoweth God, heareth us, he that is not of God, heareth us not, by this we know the spirit of truth, and the spirit of error."

Therefore, those who did not *hear* the Apostles *preaching* and instructing, were branded with the mark of the spirit of error In Mark, xvi, 15, 16, we read,

"He saith unto them, Go ye into the whole world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved; but he that believeth not, shall be condemned."

Is there, I would ask, any thing like a commandment here to give the scriptures to every man, woman, and child, and let them interpret them as they might please?—No.—But if "he will not *hear* the church, let him be to thee as the heathen and the publican."

I ask you, in the sincerity of your hearts, do you think that Christ would thus bind mankind in obedience to an authority, which could lead them into damnable error? Our Lord says emphatically, and without limitation or exception, "he that will not *hear* the church, let him be to thee as the heathen and the publican."

This, no doubt, will appear a novel doctrine to many of my hearers, who have been taught to recognize no authority in any church, and who have long worshipped the idol of private judgment. Again we read in Hebrews, xiii, 17,

"Obey your Prelates, for they watch as being to render an account of your souls."

I am at a loss to discover how the Prelates would be obliged to render an account of our souls if it be not our duty to obey them; but if, on the contrary, we may read the scriptures and interpret them at our own risk, must it follow in that case, as a necessary consequence, that the Bishops, to whom we acknow-

ledge no obedience, shall be accountable for the salvation of our souls?

"Oh! Israel, Israel, destruction is thy own—thy help is only in me."

How can the Bishops be accountable for our souls, if we do not make them our spiritual guides? I could quote twenty additional passages from scripture in support of the doctrine which I advocate, as—

"Ye are the light of the world"—"ye are the salt of the earth"—"what soever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven," &c.

I ask you, in the unaffected sincerity of a Christian heart, if Christ did not intend to bind mankind in obedience to his Church, is it not astonishing that he should have put forward in so many and such clear texts of scripture, the authority of that church? I challenge Mr. Pope to show me a single dogma in the Christian dispensation more clearly revealed in scripture. I affirm that he could not prove the divinity of Christ upon texts so clear—that cardinal dogma of Christianity is not established upon texts so plain, so natural, and so obvious. The Homilies of the church of England tell us that for upwards of 800 years, "all Christendom was involved in damnable idolatry and error." Could Christ himself leave hundreds of millions of men for 900 years in error? I ask—would he lead us into the belief of an infallible church, possessing not infallibility? Having said so much upon the subject of infallibility, let me now give you the belief of the first ages of the church which are admitted by all Protestants, and even by Luther himself to have taught the truth, and to have been pure in doctrine. The quotations which I shall here make from the Holy Fathers will go before the learned world—I will tell the page and the book in which they will be found—I have myself, in seven instances, consulted the originals, and finding them so correct, I can vouch for the accuracy of the other quotations. The first authority which I shall quote is Irenæus, a father of the Latin church, who lived in the second century. He was by birth a Greek, and his work in the original is lost, but a Latin translation has been preserved.

"Things being made thus plain (he is alluding to the derivation of doctrine from the Apostles,) it is not from others that truth is to be sought, which is easily learned *from the Church*, (or in the words of the original—*quam facile est ab ecclesiâ sumere.*) For to this church (he continues) as into a rich repository, the Apostles committed whatever is divine truth; that each one, if so inclined, might thence draw the drink of life. *This is the way of life;* all other teachers must be shunned as *thieves and robbers.* For what? Should there be any dispute on a point of small moment, must not recourse be had to the most ancient churches, where the Apostles resided, and from them collect the truth?"—*Adv. Hæres.* lib. iii cap, iv, page 205 Ed. Oxonii. 1702.

And again. "It is a duty to obey the *Priests* of the *church—eis qui in ecclesia sunt Presbyteri, obedire oportet*—who hold their succession from the Apostles, and who with that succession, received agreeably to the will of the Father, the sure pledge of truth, (*Charisima veritatis certum*;) but as to those who belong not to that leading succession they may be united, they should be suspected, either as heretics or schismatics, proudly extolling and pleasing themselves, or as hypocrites, actuated by vain glory or the love of lucre But they who impugn the truth, and excite others to *oppose* the *church* of God, their fate is with Dathan and Abiron; while schismatics who violate the *church unity—qui scindunt et separant unitatem ecclesiæ*—experience the punishment which fell on King Jeroboam."

My next authority is St. Clement, of Alexandria, *Lib. stromatum*, Book vii, page 883, Oxford edition. He was a Greek Father, and Master of the School of Alexandria. He lived in the second century.

"Those who seek may find the truth, and clearly learn from the scriptures themselves, in what manner heretics have gone astray, and on the contrary, in what manner accurate knowledge and the right doctrine are to be found in the *true* and *ancient Church only*. He ceases to be faithful to the Lord, who revolts against the received doctrines of the Church, to embrace the opinions of heretics. Heretics make use, indeed, of the scriptures; but then they use not all the sacred books; those they use are corrupted, or they chiefly urge ambiguous passages. They corrupt those truths which agree with the inspired word, and were delivered by the holy Apostles and teachers, opposing the divine tradition by human doctrines, that they may establish their heresy.—But it is clear from what has been said, that there is only *one true Church*, which alone is ancient, and there is but one God and one Lord."

Tertullian, who flourished in the end of the second century, and was a citizen of Carthage, in his book De Prescript, cap. 6, page 331. Edit. Pamelliana, 1662, says,—

"We are not allowed to indulge our own humour, nor to choose what another has invented. We have the Apostles of our Lord as founders, who were not themselves the inventors nor authors of what they left us; but they have faithfully taught the world that doctrine which they received from Christ,"

Ibidem, cap. 21. "Now to know what the Apostles taught—that is, what Christ revealed to them, recourse must be had to the Churches which they founded, and which they instructed *by word of mouth*, and *by their Epistles*. For it is plain, that all doctrine which is conformable to the faith of these mother Churches is true, being that which they received from the Apostles, the Apostles from Christ, Christ from God; and that all other opinions must be *novel* and *false*."

Century the Third.—Origen in his preface to the first book of his Periarchon, page 47, writes,—

"As there are many who think they believe what Christ taught, and some of these differ from others, it becomes necessary that all should profess that doctrine, which came down from the Apostles, and now continues in the Church (*usque ad presens in ecclesia permanens.*) That alone is truth which in nothing differs from what has been thus delivered. (*Quæ in nullo ab ecclesiastica et apostolica discordat traditione.*")

And homily the 6th, on Leviticus :—

"Let him look to it, who arrogantly puffed up, contemns the apostolic words. To me it is good to adhere to apostolic men, as to God and his Christ, and to draw intelligence from the Scriptures, according to the sense, that has been delivered by them. If we follow the mere letter of the Scriptures, and take the interpretation of the law, as the Jews commonly explain it, I shall blush to confess that the Lord should give such law. But if the law of God be understood as the *Church teaches*, then only does it transcend all human law, and is worthy of him that gave it."

And again, Tract 29, on Matthew, tome 3, page 864 :

"As often as heretics produce the canonical Scripture, in which every Christian agrees and believes, they seem to say, 'Lo! with us is the word of truth.' But to them (the heretics) we cannot give credit, nor depart from the first and ecclesiastical tradition: we can believe only as the succeeding churches of God have delivered."

I may observe, there is only a translation of Origen's works in the Latin remaining, except a few fragments of the original Greek. St. Cyprian, bishop and martyr, in his treatise De Unitate Ecclesiæ, observes :—

"Men are exposed to error, because they turn not their eyes to the fountain of truth, nor is the head sought for, nor the doctrine of the heavenly Father upheld, which things would any one seriously weigh, no long arguing would be necessary. The proof is easy—Christ addresses Peter, 'I say to thee, thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.' He that does not hold this unity of the Church, can he think that he holds the faith? He that opposes and withstands the Church, can he trust that he is in the Church?"—Page 108, &c."

And in his 66th Epistle, page 166, Oxford Edition :—

"Christ says to his Apostles, and through them to all his ministers, who by a regular ordination succeed to them,—'He that heareth you, heareth me, and he that despiseth you, despiseth me.' (Luke x. 16.) And thence have schisms and heresies arisen, when the bishop who is one, and presides over the Church, is proudly despised—*Dum Episcopus qui unus est, et Ecclesiæ præst, contemnitur.*"

Century the Fourth.—Lactantius, a convert to the Christian religion, the most accomplished scholar of the age, and tutor to Crispus, the emperor Constantine's son, and who was styled "the Christian Cicero,"—In the fourth book of his Institutions, c. 30, p. 232, Cambridge edition, thus speaks :

"The Catholic Church alone retains the true worship—this is the source of truth—this is the dwelling of faith—this the temple of God, into which he that enters not, and from which he that *goes out*, forfeits the hope of life, and of eternal salvation—*a spe vitæ ac salutis eternæ alienus est.*"

Eusebius of Palestine, in his *Præmium de Eccles. Theol.* page 60, Ed. Colon. 1687 :

"To what has been mentioned, I shall add my reasoning on the divinity of our Saviour; but nothing newly invented from myself; nothing from my own closet, nor resting on the opinion of my own sagacity. I shall deliver the uncorrupted doctrine of the Church of God, which once received from ear and eye witnesses, this church preserves inviolate."

St. Athanasius, Patriarch of Alexandria, first Epist. *ad Serapium*, p. 676, Ed. Bened. 1698:

"Let us again consider from the earliest period, the tradition, the doctrine, and faith of the Catholic church which God first delivered, which the Apostles proclaimed, and the succeeding Fathers fostered and preserved. On these authorities the church is founded, and whoever falls *from her communion* neither is, nor can be called a Christian."

Epist. ad Marcell. 9 1, p. 996, Ed. Bened. 1698:

"If you wish to confound the opinions of the Gentiles and of the heretics, and to shew that the knowledge of God is not to be found with them, but in the church alone, you may repeat the words of the 79th psalm."

St. Hilary, in his Commentary on Matthew, c. xvii, p. 673, Ed. Bened:

"Christ (teaching from the ship) intimates, that they who are out of the church can possess no understanding of the divine word. For the ship is an emblem of the church, within which, as the word of life is planted and preached, so they who are without, being as barren and useless sands, cannot understand it."

St. Basil the Great, Bishop of Cæsarea, in Cappadocia, Lib. de Spirit. Sanct. chap. xvi, t. 3, p. 34:

"The order and government of the church, is it not manifestly and beyond contradiction the work of the Holy Ghost? For he gave to his church—first, apostles; secondly, prophets; thirdly, teachers," &c.—1 *Cor.* xii, 28.

St. Ephrem of Edessa, whose works were published in Latin by Gerard Vesius, at Rome, and in Greek by Thwaites, at Oxford, and who was the disciple of St. James, Bishop of Nissibis in Mesopotamia, Sermon 25—Adv. Heres. t. 4, p. 499—Edit. Quirini—Romæ, 2740:

"They again must be reproved, who wander from the road, to run into uncertain and devious tracks; for the way of salvation holds out certain marks by which you may learn that this is the path which the Messenger of Peace trod; while the wise whom the Holy Spirit instructed walked over; and the Prophets and Apostles pointed out to us. My brethren let us walk in this way by which his divine Son travelled. This is the royal road which leads us to happiness."

St. Cyril, patriarch of Jerusalem:

"The church is called Catholic because it teaches Catholicly, and without any omission, all points that men should know concerning things visible and invisible, heavenly and earthly."—*Catechism*, 18, No. 2, page 270.

Ibidem, *Cat.* 4, No. 20.—"Learn sedulously from the church, which are the books of the *Old and New Testament*."

Ibidem, *Cat.* 5, No. —"Guard the faith, and that faith alone which is now delivered to thee by the church, confirmed as it is by all the scriptures."

Mr. Pope rose and said—Gentlemen, I find it necessary, in consequence of an observation which fell from Mr. Maguire towards the conclusion of his first speech, to give the following statement relative to my confession of faith. I shall read for you a document, which was handed to Mr. Maguire, without the slightest hesitation by Mr. Singer:

"I do not stand forward as the advocate of any particular church, but of the great leading doctrines held in common by the reformed churches, as contained in their published creeds, and as an opposer of the tenets of the church of Rome, against which they in common protest.

"Our controversy is not about church-government, but about doctrines.

"I hold the doctrine of the Trinity.

"The sufficiency of the scriptures to salvation, the Apocrypha having been rejected.

"The utter depravity of human nature, and the necessity of a change of heart, before the soul can be admitted to the kingdom of heaven.

"The guilt and condemnation of man, and justification before God by faith alone, in the finished work of Christ.

"That good works spring out necessarily of a true and lively faith.

"I protest against Infallibility; doctrine of Supererogation; Human Merit; Transubstantiation; the Sacrifice of the Mass; Service in an unknown tongue; Communion in one kind; Adoration of Images; and Invocation of Saints and Angels."

While I acknowledge to Mr. Maguire, that I could not subscribe to every one of the 39 articles, I beg to refer to the following articles, as a further exposition of my faith,—articles 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, and all the protestations against the church of Rome, contained in the other articles. Those are the principles which every real Protestant professes, and to them I most cordially subscribe.

My friend has complained, that he has discovered no tangible matter on which to oppose me. Mr. Maguire should remember, that we accuse the church of Rome of overwhelming the whole structure of Christianity, by the *addition* of novel opinions; and, therefore, he cannot find fault with me, if my profession of faith is contained within a much shorter compass than his. Mr. Maguire has touched upon some subjects, amongst others, the right of private judgment, which by our arrangements were not to come under consideration until a future day—I shall not follow him in his wanderings, but shall at once proceed to the subject more immediately before us—the proofs of the infallibility of the Roman Catholic church. My learned friend has endeavored to prove his point, by bringing forward various passages of scripture, which he, no doubt, looked upon as proofs. But I charge him at once with a "*petitio principii*," and maintain that the onus rests on him of proving that the church of Rome is the church of Christ. Until he shall bring forward proofs to demonstrate this, the passages which he has adduced relative to the church of Christ are irrelevant. My learned friend has also brought forward various quotations from the Fathers. While I admit, that as historians and witnesses of what may have occurred in the times during which they lived, we may receive the testimony of the Fathers; yet I do say, we are not to place any great weight upon their authority—and I contend for it, that we are only to

receive their expositions, when those expositions approve themselves to our judgments, as in accordance with the general tenor of the sacred scriptures. Having made these general remarks upon the Fathers, I beg to read the advice given by St. Augustin and Chrysostom, which, perchance, may assist Mr. Maguire in deciding, whether the church of Rome be the church of Christ. From St. Augustin, "*De Unitate Ecclesiæ*," cap. 16, I read as follows. Speaking of the Donatists:—

"Let them," he says, "if they can demonstrate their church not by the talk and rumor of the Africans; not by the Councils of their own Bishops; not by the books of their disputers; not by deceitful miracles, against which we are cautioned by the word of God, but in the prescript of the law, in the predictions of the Prophets, in the verses of the Psalms, in the voice of the Shepherd himself, in the preaching and works of the Evangelists; that is, in all canonical authorities of the sacred scriptures."

St. Chrysostom also:

"Formerly it might have been ascertained by various means, which was the true church, BUT AT PRESENT THERE IS NO OTHER MEANS LEFT FOR THOSE WHO ARE WILLING TO DISCOVER THE TRUE CHURCH OF CHRIST BUT BY THE SCRIPTURES ALONE. And why? Because heresy has all outward observances in common with her. If a man, therefore, be desirous of knowing the true Church, how will he be able to do it amidst so great a resemblance, but by the scriptures alone? Wherefore, our Lord foreseeing that such a great confusion of things would take place in the latter days, ordered the Christians to have recourse to nothing but the scriptures."—*Hom.* 49, *in Matt.* xxiv.

From these quotations, you will perceive, that much of the controversy resolves itself into this simple question—Are the doctrines of the church of Rome those which the Bible teaches? How then are we to know this but from the Bible? We must first then be in possession of the doctrines of the church of Christ, in order to determine, whether the church of Rome be the church of Christ—and then, forsooth, we must go back to the church of Rome, in order to learn what the doctrines of the church of Christ are?

Methinks, my friend should have given some definition of "The Church."—He should have stated, where the infallibility of the church is lodged. Whether in a general council, independently of the Pope, or whether in the Pope independently of a general council—whether in a council and the Pope together—or in the universal church dispersed throughout the world—for if I know not where this infallibility lies, even supposing that it did exist, of what possible use can it be to me? I assert, that there is not a single passage throughout the entire scriptures, in which the word "church" means the body of the ecclesiastical officers exclusive of the Christian congregations over which they preside. The word church occurs in about ninety places in the New Testament · and there is not one, in which i

n to be understood of the ecclesiastical governors of the church, to the exclusion of the people under their charge.

We shall see the opinions of the Fathers on the meaning of the word church. St. Clemens Alexandrinus, calls the church a congregation of the elect.—(*Strom.* 7, p. 715.) In the same sense it is used by St. Ignatius, by Critopulus, by St. Cyril of Alexandria, by Isidore Pelusiota, (Ig. *ad* Trall Crit. *in Confess. Fid.* c. 7. Cyril, in cap. 42, Ies. p. 54. Isid. ep. 246, l. 2, p 256,) and others. Iobius Monachus says, that "the peop believing in God constitute the church."—(In Bib. Phot. Cod. 122, p. 636.) To nearly the same effect speaks St. Basil, Theophylact, (Basil ep. 393. Theoph. in 1 ad Cor. c. 1, p. 164,) and other Fathers and eminent ecclesiastical writers. Zonaras, who may be considered as high authority in respect of the import of ecclesiastical terms, says, that "the word 'church,' properly denotes a congregation of the faithful."—(Ad Can. 6. Grang. p. 314.) We see, therefore, from the scriptures themselves, and from the authority of the Fathers whom I have quoted, that the word "church" does not signify an ecclesiastical synod or a general council—but the *body* of the faithful. So that even supposiug it did appear from the scriptures, that the church of Christ is infallible, it is evident that that infallibility must not be restricted to the ecclesiastical rulers, but must be extended to the entire body of Christians scattered over the world, laics as well as ecclesiastics. My friend next referred to Isaiah, lix, 21, and he told us that many Protestant divines consider the prophet as speaking in that passage of the future church. I beg to say, however, that many learned Protestants have considered it as referring to the Jewish church, subsequently to their restoration and introduction to the Christian dispensation. —If it confers a privilege on any, it confers it on all wh constitute the church of Christ; but it seems to confer *particularly on the Jewish church*, as the promise was originally addressed to them. The words are, "my spirit that is in thee shall not depart from out of thy mouth from henceforth," &c. The learned gentleman in his next remark, also followed up the *petitio principii*, "as my Father sent me, so also send I you," and takes for granted that these words apply to successors of the Apostles. But the onus is on him to prove, that every thing said o the Aposties is also said to their successors; and again the onus rests on him to show, that the ecclesiastics or Popes of Rome are the successors of the Apostles. This he has not yet attempted to show, and until he does so, of what avail are all his assertions. Again he quotes, "Behold I am with you all days," and asks, how could he be with the Apostles to the end of the world, seeing they were mortal men? He should bear in mind,

that not a line of the New Testament was written when he spoke these words. The "end" is regarded by many as the consummation of the Mosaical dispensation—the original word is literally "age," and not world. But Christ was in truth with the Apostles while in the flesh, in the power of his spirit; and he will no doubt, be with *their doctrines* (which under the influence of the holy spirit, they committed to writing,) to the consummation of time—blessing them to the salvation of thousands yet unborn. But here I meet my friend, and deny that there are in the strict sense of the term any successors to the Apostles. When *I shall see men performing miracles in the broad face of day*, like them proving their doctrines by the law and the testimony, evidencing by the holiness of their lives that they are not of this world, and that they are valiant for the truth on earth; then, and not till then, can I allow, that there are in the strict sense of the word any successors to the Apostles.

"Whatever ye shall bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven," has been alluded to by my friend. Why should that promise be exclusively claimed by the Pope and his clergy, which was made to the Apostles at large.—(Mat. xviii, 18.) It is a fact, which rests on the authority of historical testimony, that no bishop of the church of Rome assumed the title of universal bishop till the year 606, in the time of Boniface; and Gregory the great, in an epistle written a few years before that period, makes this striking remark: "That if any person assume the title of universal priest, he is a forerunner of antichrist." But I would ask, if the promise was to be extended to any of the successors, why not *to the successor of Peter at Antioch*, and to the successors of the other Apostles, to Polycarp, and to others of the early Fathers. My friend has said, that our Saviour promised to communicate his power to the apostles, when he said, "All things are given unto me in heaven and in earth." I really cannot discover this from the context. It is said, *all* power is given unto the Saviour; but because the power is given unto him, does it follow that he communicated that power to his Apostles and their successors? The promises, even if admitted in the sense of my learned friend, rests upon this condition, "Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you." Therefore, Mr. Maguire should show that the church of Rome is in accordance with the word of God? My friend has again referred to the church being "the pillar and the ground of faith." Now, as I stated, before he can apply this or any similar passage to the church of Rome, he must first show that that church is the church of Christ—this he has not yet been able to prove and I assert with confidence that he NEVER will.

I do admit indeed, that the universal body of the faithful, by

setting forth the purity of Christian doctrine, by exhibiting its practical influence, and by assembling on the Lord's day, hold up a blazing light to the world, are "an Epistle known and read of men," and thus diffuse the truth as it is in Jesus. But I do not thence infer, that infallibility is the prerogative of the church of Christ, though I do hold that against the faithful the gates of hell shall not prevail, and that "neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate them from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord." To be preserved by the power of God, and to be watched over by his providence, does not imply infallibility; and without the possession of such a prerogative, the church of Christ may be the pillar and ground of truth, by being a living exemplar of the influence of Christian doctrine." "To hear the Church," refers not to the universal church, *but to the particular church* with which the parties concerned happen to be connected. How is it possible, that an individual could make his complaint to the universal church! The gentleman has endeavored to give us an illustration, by comparing the church to the constituted authorities of the land. But I would ask, although we do look upon them as the proper expounders of the law of the nation, and appeal to them to decide in matters of dispute; and although we do admit "that the powers that be are ordained of God," does this argue, that we consider them as infallible? As far as the commands of the church of Christ accord with the word of God, so far, and no farther, are they ratified in heaven.

The expression "obey your prelates," my friend has also quoted. Now, in the original, the word is ηγουμενοις.—"Obey them that have the rule over you." We must be careful to attend to the tenor and spirit of scripture, and call no man master, save in so far as his guidance is agreeable to the word and will of God. Let it not be imagined that I am opposed to pastoral authority. No, far from it—"Christ gave to his church, first, apostles,—secondly, prophets—thirdly, pastors and teachers, for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ. My friend has referred to the passage, "Ye are the salt of the earth." He should have continued the Saviour's words, "If the salt have lost its savor, wherewith shall it be salted?" Does this, I would ask, look like infallibility—"If the salt lose its savor, wherewith shall it be salted? It is then fit for nothing, but to be cast out and trodden under foot."

Mr. Maguire has also referred to the passage, "Whose-soever sins ye forgive, they are forgiven, and whose-soever sins ye retain, they are retained." Now it must be remembered, that

the time our Lord uttered these words, not a line of the New Testament was written. Christ was about to introduce a new dispensation; and he appointed his Apostles as ministers of his new kingdom, with authority to exact laws and regulations for the governance thereof. The Saviour fully commissioned his Apostles to make known the glories of his divine character, and the principles of Heaven's administration—to lay down the way of salvation, clearly and fully through a Redeemer's blood, and to describe the character of those whose sins had been blotted out, or in other words to depict the sanctifying influence of the gospel upon the life and conversation. I admit the power of the church of Christ to excommunicate from its society any, who by their unholy lives disgrace their profession, or, by their errors as to the fundamental doctrines of Christianity, give evidence, that they are not the followers of our Lord and Saviour. But even the authority of excommunication is restricted; for it avails except so far as the decision agrees with the will of heaven. Further—there is no standard authority as to discipline in the church of Rome; for Doctor Doyle, in his examination on oath before the Lord's committee, page 240, when asked, "Does the last article in the priest's oath declare every thing done in the council of Trent binding?" replied, "That regards faith, not discipline. The French church never received the decrees of the council of Trent regarding discipline: and in a part of Ireland such decrees are not received." My friend has spoken much about unity of sentiment and supreme authority. The passage just read furnishes a sufficient commentary on his assertions relative to these points. There are many other proofs which I could adduce, that the church of Rome possesses no claim whatever to infallibility—but my time at present does not permit. Mr. Pope here resumed his seat.

Mr. MAGUIRE.—I regret exceedingly, that after all my endeavours to the reverse, this controversy is likely to be a war of words, and not of argument. Let us come to close fighting—let Mr. Pope propose his objections *seriatim*, and I pledge myself to answer them to your satisfaction. I fearlessly appeal to scripture. He has stated that not a single passage in the New Testament refers to church authority independently of the congregation. I aver that there are many such passages; when our Saviour says,—"If he will not hear thee, tell the church: and if he will not hear the church, let him be to thee as the heathen and the publican;" he evidently alludes to a tribunal before which the offender is to be arraigned. Was the Bishop to be arraigned before the peasant, and not the peasant before the Bishop? No—Christ intended that there should be rulers in

his church—that the Apostles, with their successors, should constitute a tribunal, to which obedience should be rendered and from which the ignorant and the illiterate should receive instruction in the faith. Mr. Pope says, that our Saviour must refer to a particular church, and not to the universal church, from the impossibility of referring to the latter. He might as well say, that any individual who sought redress from the laws of his country, should appeal to the congregated magistrates of the country. An individual can appeal to a Bishop, as to a magistrate—he can appeal from the Bishop to a Synod—from the Synod he can appeal to the Pope, and from the Pope to a general Council, which, like the House of Lords, is the last resource. It was extraordinary sophistry, then, to argue, as Mr. Pope has done, that there is no tribunal but the universal church.

He endeavors to bring the Holy Fathers into a qualified disrepute, as Luther did before him. When Luther found the authority of the holy Fathers strong against him, he said, "I care not if a thousand Chrysostoms, a thousand Cyprians, a thousand Augustines, stood up against me. And let this be my creed, 'I yield to no man.'" Again, he says, "I, Dr. Martin Luther, as to those matters (articles of faith,) am and wish to be deemed obstinate, contumacious, and violent." Such was Luther's confession that the Fathers were against him. When Luther found a great number of sects arising amongst the reformers—Calvin denying the real presence—Zuinglius saying, that THIS IS MY BODY, means "this REPRESENTS my body," he began to repent, and he threatened to return to Popery again, if they continued to raise such schisms. Mr. Pope should not endeavor to bring the Holy Fathers into disrepute. If he says that they were fallible, which I admit, yet he must allow that they are good and faithful witnesses of what was the Christian doctrine in their days. If I show, as I will, the infallibility of the church to be the doctrine of sixty Fathers at a time, when Mr. Pope will admit that the church was pure, then is it not evident that such doctrine must be true? If Mr. Pope answers in the negative, then he must contradict all Protestants who admit the authority of the first four councils—I do not include the council of Jerusalem. Mr. Pope has said, that he cannot discover where this authority exists in the Catholic church. If he had examined our divines and canonists, he would find that the Pope, at the head of a council regularly convened, in their decrees regarding faith, are admitted to be infallible. That is one instance.—Also, if the Pope, with a few bishops assembled, should issue decrees touching the deposit of faith, and which are subsequently received by the church dispersed, we account them infallible, as otherwise the promises of Christ to his church would fail

As to the title Ecumenical, assumed by Boniface, it certainly was condemned by Gregory the Great, when assumed in a different sense by the patriarch of Constantinople. It was then condemned by Gregory as a blasphemous heresy, because, as he said, there was no universal bishop in the unlimited sense meant by the patriarch of Constantinople, but Christ, who is with his church to the end of the world, teaching and preaching. But in a *limited* sense, the expression is not to be condemned, and that was the sense in which it was claimed by Boniface.

Again, "as the Father has sent me, I also send you." Mr. Pope says, I did not prove that this was directed to any but the apostles. I have already proved that our Savior promised he would be with them to the end of the world—not that they should live in a physical, but in a moral sense, and survive in the persons of their successors. Mr. Pope says that this applied to the Jewish church. I am sure the church of England will be much obliged to him, for all his arguments tend as strongly against the established church of England, as against the church of Rome. The church of England, in her homilies, declares that she will not *endure* a departure from her liturgy in the slightest degree. So far she claims obedience to her authority as well as the Catholic church. There could not in fact exist any regularity or order if Christ did not leave an authority to his church. Mr. Pope says, granting for a moment the church of Christ to be infallible, that the onus lies upon me to prove that the church of Rome is the church of Christ—this argument is merely *ad captandum*. After I have proved that Christ established one true and infallible church on earth, do I not lay the hatchet to the root of all the rest, and thus prove the falsehood of all the heresies that have separated from that church? and consequently have I not broken the neck of Protestantism generally? Is it not evident that I can prove the infallibility of the church in the times of the Apostles, and under their successors, the bishops and martyrs, who died for the truth? If Mr. Pope once admits the infallibility of any church, I have gained my point. I have proved to you manifestly that the passage which I quoted from Isaiah has reference to a future church. I shall read to you the passage again, with the preceding verse:—

"And there shall come a Redeemer to Zion, and to them that return from iniquity in Jacob, saith the Lord. This is my covenant with them, saith the Lord; my spirit that is in thee, and my words that I have put into thy mouth, shall not depart out of thy mouth, nor out of the mouth of thy seed, nor out of the mouth of thy seed's seed, saith the Lord, from henceforth, and forever." *Isaiah*, lix, 20, 21.

Here the inspired prophet speaks of a Redeemer to come to Zion, and to establish his church. Could there be a more obvi-

sole allusion to Christ and his church. In reference to my quotation "ye are the salt of the earth," Mr. Pope has reminded me of the addition, "If the salt shall lose its savor." I deny that the salt does lose its savor—I am not a chemist, but I can state upon the authority of the most learned men, that salt *cannot* lose its savor—this, therefore, proves the infallibility of the church. The Apostles are compared to salt, and as soon as the salt *would* lose its savor, they *would* lose their infallibility—that is never. Mr. Pope argues that when Christ talked of the church, he talked of the laity—will it be inferred, because Christ speaks one time in the aggregate, that he never speaks particularly of the bishops and rulers whom the Holy spirit appointed to govern the church. Mr. Pope says that the passage, "obey your prelates," means, "obey your superiors in general." What says the Apostle Paul?

"Obey your prelates, and be subject to them. For they watch, as being to render an account of your souls," &c.

Are laymen, or magistrates, by Christ's appointment, to render an account of our souls? It would be absurd to suppose that the bishops should give an account of that which they have not the government. What signifies how a government exists, if obedience be not rendered to it?—How absurd to suppose that an authority could exist, and yet the people not be obliged to obey it. It is evident if an episcopal church were established by Christ, that bishops must be recognised in it. Our Saviour gave the feeding of the sheep and lambs to one, but he also gave the feeding of the lambs to the bishops. Mr. Pope contends that the text "Feed my lambs, and feed my sheep," equally applies to all the Apostles, but did not Christ address himself to Peter *only*, when he said, "Simon Barjona, lovest thou me more than these?" And when Peter answered "Yea, Lord,"—Christ replied, "Feed my lambs, feed my sheep."—Did he not also declare that there should be but "one fold, and one shepherd." Now I should be glad to learn what is there in a sheep-fold, beyond sheep and lambs? That is—dropping the metaphor, beyond clergy and laity. When, therefore, Christ commissioned Peter to feed both sheep and lambs, he gave him a charge over the clergy as well as the laity.—This is the sacred edifice raised by Christ, from which Mr. Pope has not been able to pick a single stone.

Mr. Pope has pronounced an eulogium upon the scriptures—I too love and honor them, and I trust that in my life, I follow their commands. I pay that respect to the scriptures, which I pay to the images of our Saviour, his Apostles, and martyrs; I follow their precepts, I hope; but as to the adoration either of scriptures or of images, my soul abhors—my nerves shrink from it. If, however the scriptures had been intended as the sole

rule of faith, it is evident that Christ would have given a command to write them. But no such command was given by our Saviour. He ordered his Apostles to go teach and preach; and that those who *believed* would be saved. Believed what? The preaching of the Apostles. But he said nothing about writing. My arguments remain solid and undisturbed. I therefore sit down, till objections of a more tangible and serious nature shall be advanced.

Mr. POPE rose and said—My learned friend has observed, that he will wait, until some stronger arguments shall be brought forward against him. I really commend the spirit which he has evinced on this occasion. He remarks, that the arguments which I have advanced are not sufficiently weighty to deserve a reply; and he reserves his proofs, that the church of Rome is the church of Christ, until the third day of the discussion. The passages of scripture which speak of the church, I again affirm, do not refer to ecclesiastics exclusively. While I admit, that the church of Christ will be *preserved* through every age, and that the gates of hell shall never prevail against it, I still maintain, that not one single passage of scripture has been adduced, or can be brought forward, proving that our Saviour conferred *infallibility upon his church*; and I again put Mr. Maguire to the proof of it.

I shall now show you, from the testimony of Roman Catholic writers, that the term, "church of Rome," was not considered as a designation of the general church of Christ; but that it was at first merely given to distinguish that particular church from other churches—I would therefore ask, on what ground can the church of Rome arrogate to herself the right of being considered as the church of Christ, more than other churches. Dupin, a Roman Catholic historian, and a doctor of the Sorbonne, has the following passage:

"It is true (says he) that at present the name of the church of Rome is given to the Catholic church, and that these two terms pass for synonymous. But in antiquity no more was intended by the name of the church of Rome, than the church of the city of Rome; and the Popes in their subscriptions and superscriptions, took simply the quality of Bishops of Rome. The Greek schismatics seem to be the first who gave the name of the church of Rome to all the churches of the West; whence the Latins made use of this to distinguish the churches which communicated with the church of Rome, from the Greeks, who were separated from her communion. From this came the custom to give the name of the church of Rome to the Catholic church.—But the other churches did not for this lose their name or their authority," &c. —(*Dupin. Traité de la Puiss. Eccles. &c*, p. 551.)

Here, then, we see nothing, even upon Roman Catholic testimony, to induce us to esteem the Roman Catholic church as exclusively the church of Christ.

Again, Pope Innocent III tells us, (lib. ii, Ep. 200.)

"The church, indeed, is called Universal, which consists of all churches every where, which, by a Greek word, is denominated Catholic, thus THE ROMAN CHURCH IS NOT THE UNIVERSAL CHURCH, BUT A PART OF THE UNIVERSAL CHURCH."

Here are the opinions of a Pope and a Roman Catholic historian. Both passages clearly show, that the term "church of Rome" did not signify the universal church of Christ, but that the title merely distinguished it from the other churches, which had been established in various parts of the world.

I shall now show you, that the Fathers referred to the written word as the standard of faith. I shall quote to you the opinion of St. Ignatius, who was contemporary with the Apostles, and successor (so to speak) of St. Peter in Antioch.—It is recorded by Eusebius, lib. iii, Ecc. Hist. cap. 36. He informs us, that Ignatius being on his way from Syria to Rome, where he was to suffer martyrdom, addressed himself to the several churches on his journey, establishing them in the faith, and cautioning them against the heresies which then prevailed.—"He exhorted them *to hold firmly by the tradition of the Apostles, which testifying that it had been already committed to writing*, he declared *was necessarily so for its preservation.*"

Augustine also, in his lib. iii, contr. Lit. Petiliani c. 6.

"If any one concerning Christ or his church, or concerning any other thing which belongs to faith or our life, I will not say, if we, but (what Paul hath added) if an angel from heaven shall preach unto you, beside what you have received in the legal and evangelical scripture, let him be accursed."

Again, St. Jerome, in c. 1st, Aggæi.

"Those things which they make and find, as it were, by Apostolical tradition, without the authority and testimony of Scripture, the word of God smites."

In my letter to Mr. Maguire, which appeared in the public prints, I referred to the opposition maintained by the early Fathers against the authority of the church of Rome. Whenever therefore, they advocated the authority of the church of Christ it would not be *the authority of that church which they themselves opposed.* But my friend brought forward an analogy, and asked me, "does not each particular magistrate in his own jurisdiction represent the executive authority?" And he argued from this, that each and every individual bishop should be regarded in the same light with respect to the church. I ask him, will he say that each and every particular bishop of the church of Rome is infallible? I am sure Mr. Maguire believes no such thing.

Further—in order to show my friend, that the power of judging was vested not in a single person, but in the body of the Christian congregation, I refer him to the first Epistle to the Corinthians, v, 12, where the apostle asks, "Do you not judge

them that are within?" And I inquire, to whom was this query addressed? Was it to the ecclesiastical rulers, or to the body of the church? Consult the Douay edition of the scriptures and you will find, that the epistle is addressed "to the church of God that is at Corinth, to them that are sanctified in Christ Jesus, called to be saints, with all that invoke the Lord Jesus Christ, in every place."—Now, I would ask my friend, are ecclesiastical officers the only individuals thus denominated? Are they alone the sanctified in Christ Jesus? Are they alone called to be saints, and do they alone invoke the name of our Lord and Saviour? In the 2d epistle to the same church, ii, 10, it is said, "to whom ye have pardoned any thing, I also." A reference to the epistle will show that this passage also refers to the entire body. My friend quoted a verse of the 18th chapter of Matthew "Wherever two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them." Now I of course admit this. The great head of the church, the Lord Jesus Christ, is present with his people, wherever they are congregated in his name.—But, though present with them by His Spirit, does he, therefore, confer on them the prerogative of infallibility?

As to the testimony of the Fathers—I am quite willing to admit, that they may be referred to as faithful witnesses of the opinions current in their times. And, is not every faithful historian entitled to the same credit? But I would ask, when we refer to Hume, or to any other historian, do we thence infer, that, because they are faithful witnesses, they are, therefore, infallible? My friend has referred to two sources of infallibility. Now we are informed by Charles Butler, Esq., in his Book of the Roman Catholic church, p. 121—124, that there does exist a difference between the Italians and the French church, respecting the infallibility of the Pope. The Italians believe in the infallibility of the Pope; the French hold the contrary opinion—the former receive the dogmas of the Pope as infallible; the latter reject them, if they be only *per se* or *ex-cathedra*. Here we have two bodies referring to sources of infallibility, which may often jar with each other. I therefore ask, can there be any certainty, on their own grounds, as to the foundation of their faith? My friend has commented on the opinion of Pope Gregory, in reference to the title of the Pope. I shall read to you the passage.

"I confidently say, that whosoever calls himself the Universal Priest, or desires to be so called, in his arrogance, is a forerunner of Antichrist."—*Lib. vi, Ep.* 30.

Gregory VII, tells us, l. ii, ep. 55, that "the Roman Pontiff alone is rightly called universal." Here then again you will perceive, that we have Pope against Pope, and one body against another body on the authority and infallibility of the Pope. In

relation to the passage which my friend has quoted, where our Saviour says, "he will be with his disciples to the consummation of time," I merely observed, that it is the opinion of some ancient critics, that the words mean "to the end of the Mosaic dispensation,"—not but that our Saviour will be with his Apostles *in their writings* to the end of time. While, however, I mention this, merely as the opinion of eminent critics, I am quite willing to allow, that although the Apostles have no successors in the strict sense of the term, our Lord has promised to be with those who labor in the word and doctrine, by giving seals to their ministry, *as long as they continue to teach whatsoever he has commanded in His Holy Word.*

My friend has again referred to the passage which says, "if the salt lose its savor," and he has told us, that salt cannot lose its flavor, and therefore would build upon it the infallibility of the church of Rome. That salt for a long time retains its savor, I admit; but can my friend prove that it is never decomposed.—And does he not, by his remark upon the passage, make the adorable Redeemer contradict himself? Although our Lord knew all things, we invariably find him, in his discourses with his disciples and others, using those terms which were most familiar to them, and accommodating his language to their capacities and modes of thinking.—Even in the present day, we speak of the rising and setting of the sun, although it is known that the sun neither rises nor sets.—These remarks account for our Saviour's employing the mode of expression which we are considering. In connection with this passage, I would ask, was there not a Judas even among the Apostles, and did he not sell his master, and put himself to death?

I shall now refer Mr. Maguire to a passage of scripture, and I ask him how he can reconcile the infallibility of the church of Rome with it? In Romans, xi, 22, "See then the goodness and the severity of God: towards them indeed that are fallen, the severity; but towards thee, the goodness of God, *if thou abide in goodness, otherwise thou also shalt be cut off.*" Mark this! "otherwise thou also shalt be cut off." I ask, does the church of Rome in the present day wish to identify herself with the early church to which the Apostle wrote these words, or not? If not, then is her antiquity scattered to the four winds of heaven. And if she does, I would ask, is not this a strange threat to be addressed to an infallible church!

My friend has again quoted the passage, "He that will not hear the church"—but can he show that this speaks of pastors exclusively, and not of the people also? I have already proved, that every Christian body is authorised to judge them that are without. "Feed my sheep" was another passage brought for-

ward by Mr Maguire; and in reference to it, I beg to call your attention to the authorities of some early Fathers on the subject. St. Augustin says—"when it is said unto Peter, 'feed my sheep,' *it is said unto* ALL."—(De agon. Christ, c. 30.) St. Ambrose says, "which sheep and flock St. Peter did not receive alone, but we all received them with him."—(Lib. de Sacred.) The passage, "one fold and one shepherd," has been quoted by Mr. Maguire. Our Lord's meaning clearly is this, that the church which had been confined exclusively to the Jews, was now to combine both Jew and Gentile; that the barrier which separated them, was henceforth to be thrown down, and the waters of life to flow beyond the limits of the Jewish people, carrying health and fertility through the whole world. The onus lies on my friend, to show where the church of Rome is called the church of Christ, or where the Pope is called the shepherd. I am convinced that he cannot do so. I assert, on the contrary, that to call any creature the head of Christ's church on earth, is to utter a blasphemy against the Son of God, who is alone the head of the church. The Psalmist says, "The Lord is my shepherd, and I shall not want."—Psalm xxii. But my friend has again referred to the passage in Isaiah, where it is said, that "the words of the Lord shall not depart out of thy mouth from henceforth and for ever." If you consult the context, you will perceive that it was probably addressed in an especial sense to the Jewish church, as he mentions Zion and Jacob. Some commentators do refer it to the restoration of literal Israel. But in truth, if this promise confers infallibility on any church, then the promise of the Holy Spirit will confer infallibility on every believer. In the epistle to the Romans, St. Paul says, "If any man have not the spirit of Christ, he is none of his." Now, I ask my friend, are we to understand by this, that *every individual* having the spirit of Christ is thereby rendered infallible? May not a person be enlightened by the holy spirit, without being rendered infallible also? The passage from Isaiah, therefore, does not prove any thing for my learned friend's argument. He has again quoted, "Obey your prelates." Now, I find in other parts of the sacred scriptures that we are desired "to try the spirits whether they are of God, because many false prophets have gone out into the world." Again, I read, "to the law and to the testimony, if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them," or as the Douay version gives it, "they shall not see the morning light." And again, I find St. Paul saying, "I speak as unto wise men, judge ye yourselves what I say."—(1 Cor. x, 15.) And our Lord himself asks, "why even of your ownselves, judge ye not what is right?"—(Luke xii, 57,) If we are thus desired to try

he spirits—to go to the law and the testimony and to judge and examine for ourselves, are we, in opposition to the express dictates of the word of God, to receive every thing which an ecclesiastic tells us, without examining whether the doctrines and precepts inculcated upon us are in accordance with, or opposed to, the revealed will of heaven? And if we are authorised to examine, as to the truth or falsehood of the doctrines brought before us, then will it clearly follow, that no church is infallible.

In conclusion, I shall now propose one or two questions to my learned friend, to which I shall thank him to give me explicit answers. In the first place, I should wish him to inform me, how many general Councils have been held?

Secondly—By what characteristics are general Councils to be distinguished from others?

Thirdly—Can my reverend friend produce an authenticated translation of the scriptures, perfect and infallible?

And Fourthly—Can he point us to an infallible commentary upon those scriptures?

These questions I put to him, and these questions must be satisfactorily answered; or else I assert, that I have strong presumptive evidence against the infallibility of the church of Rome For I say, if the church of Rome be infallible, we may expect, that she is able to refer her doctrines to *an infallible and clearly attested* standard—and that she has given to her people *an infallible* and authentic version of the sacred scriptures—and, as she holds that a commentary is indispensably necessary, we may also expect that she has furnished *an infallible* commentary, so that her followers may not wander in the wilderness of error but have a sure and certain guide to direct them. A priest declares at his ordination on oath, that he,

"Unhesitatingly receives all things, defined, delivered, and declared by the holy canons, and general councils;"

and I ask, therefore, have I not a right to put these questions to any priest of the Roman Catholic church?

Mr. MAGUIRE.—It may, perhaps, appear to many of my auditory, that I have an Herculean task to perform. A great number of questions have been put to me to answer, which would require much more than the comparatively short period allotted to me for addressing you. Mr. Pope opened his speech by endeavoring to draw a distinction between the church of Rome and the Catholic church. I beg and crave the kind and impartial attention of all, while I clear up what he seems to consider an insurmountable difficulty. In the early ages of Christianity the church was not known by any other name than that of the

Catholic church. It was so designated in the Apostles' creed No other church had then the audacity to compare itself with the church of Christ. In the lapse of time, however, when the Arians became impudent and powerful—when they got the Emperor Constantius on their side, and the temporal power was employed to subvert the church of Christ—when, in fine, those heretics, imitating the example of Julian the apostate, who rooted up the foundation of the old temple of Jerusalem, and vainly attempted to rebuild it, in order to falsify the prediction of the Son of God—sought to disprove the promises of Christ to his church, by overturning its government, and establishing a new one—it was then thought necessary, for distinction sake, to superadd the epithet Roman, as a communion with the See of Rome was looked upon as the *test* of unity, and all other churches declared heretical or schismatical, which refused to acknowledge the bishop of Rome, the vicar of Christ on earth. Thus the word consubstantial was first introduced at the Council of Nice. We all know that the term had no origin in the scriptures. The word, however, is to be found in the Liturgy of the Protestan church. My friend must admit that the term "Roman" was introduced lawfully, and according to the gospel, or he must deny that the term "consubstantial," was introduced lawfully—he must deny the Council of Nice, which is acknowledged by Dr Walton, and all Protestant historians. The name makes nothing for my friend's argument. Though the name Roman has been added, it is still the same church. When Arius broached his heresy, the Catholic church either then was in existence, or it was not. If it was then in existence, Arius had no right to set up a church against the church of God. If it was not the Catholic church which condemned Arius, the church which he set up could not be the Catholic church, for he, for a time, stood alone. Where was the Catholic church at the time when Luther, as he says himself, stood alone, and was the only one who had the courage to apply the hatchet to the root of Popery? The name Roman was then, as I have clearly proved to you, given to the Catholic church to serve as a distinction.

I have already explained to you, that the title ecumenical, *as assumed* by the patriarch of Constantinople, was blasphemous. Christ is the only ecumenical pastor—he is the foundation and the corner-stone. The Aposties formed the edifice—But if the word be taken in the limited sense in which it is applied to the bishop of Rome—that is the visible head of the Universal Church—it is not blasphemy. Mr. Pope has repeated the quotation from St. Augustin—there the arguments of St. Augustin are employed against the Donatists, who, like Mr. Pope himself, set up their own authority against that of the Catholic

church—who appealed from the authority of the church, and from a regularly ordained ministry to their own private opinions. It is just as if an individual having been condemned in the King's Bench, then appealed to the House of Lords, and then to the King, and, on the decision being given against him, he should recur to his own private authority.

Mr. Pope has quoted St. Augustin and St. Jerome, who distinguished between the church of Rome, and the Catholic church. But those fathers have sometimes spoken of the church of Rome as a diocess, or as a patriarchate. Did they, however, deny that the church of Rome was the mother and matrice of all other churches? Let them speak for themselves.

In his eleventh book *De Doctrina Christiana*, where laying down a rule to distinguish canonical books, St. Augustin says—

"In this inquiry, the authority of the greater part of the Churches must be followed, and particularly of those that hold apostolical sees, and received epistles from the Apostles."

And lib. *Contra Evistolam Fundamenti*, he says—

"Many are the considerations which keep me in the Catholic church—the assent of nations—her authority—first established by miracles—cherished by hope—extended by charity—strengthened by lapse of years; *the succession* of pastors from *the chair of Peter*, to whom the *Lord committed* the *care* of *feeding his flock down to the present bishop;* lastly, the *name itself of Catholic.*"

Thus he identifies the Catholic church with the bishop of Rome, to whom he says, Christ committed the care of feeding his flock. So much for the distinction between the church of Rome and the Catholic church.

Mr. Pope admits, that a man may be excommunicated. How can the church excommunicate unless it possess authority? Is it not evident too, that it is an authority to which man should yield obedience? What does St. Augustin say?

"I would not believe the gospel, if the authority of the Catholic church did not move me thereto."

Will Mr. Pope show me, that he does not deviate from the living authority of the Catholic church? I defy him to do so. He appeals, indeed, to an invisible church—he quotes a text of scripture to prove, that where two or three are gathered in the Lord's name, there will he be in the midst of them. This is no new doctrine. There our Lord speaks of private prayer.—The Apostles command all to believe in the holy Catholic church. There never existed a time since the Apostles in which that holy Catholic church was not visible on earth, otherwise the Apostles would have bound us to believe in a church of whose existence there was no certainty.

Let Mr. Pope reconcile the idea of a Universal church, to that of two or three being assembled in Christ's name, or let

h m snow that two or three establish our notion of universality Mr. Pope in vain appeals to his invisible church. This is an argument which would delight our infidels. The Jew may say to the Christian—"Christ made great promises to his church according to your account—he declared, the gates of hell should not prevail against her—and he said, that whoever should not hear her, should be condemned; he also compared her to a city built upon a mountain. Yet, we find that he has not fulfilled his promises—that his church may fail—that the gates of hell have prevailed against her—that the spirit of God has departed from her and that the promises of visibility have been shamefully violated. It is then necessary for you to look out for that Messiah, whose coming we daily expect." These arguments might be used against the man who admits, that a time did exist, since the coming of Christ, when there was no visible church upon earth. With regard to the authorities which I have produced from the holy Fathers, I have quoted from them where they expressly treat of the authority of the church—I do not select passages from them where they allude to the church, merely by a side wind, and which passages prove nothing upon the subject. Mr. Pope calls upon me to produce a genuine infallible translation of the Bible—*that is* to be found in our church, which is not in his. We have the Latin vulgate, the noble translation of St. Jerome, and approved of by the council of Trent—that is our acknowledged and authentic Bible. I retort upon Mr. Pope—I call upon him to show me any translation in his church, that can be said to be infallible. The Protestant church is fallible—the translators of their Bible were fallible—and the man who reads it is fallible. How can certainty be built upon uncertainty? How can infallibility proceed from fallibilities, or to use an expression of a great dignitary of the Established church, "How can an *immoveable* edifice be built upon a *moveable* foundation?"

Let Mr. Pope answer that argument if he can; a child who is born in Mr. Pope's communion must remain a Deist till he has arrived at the years of discretion. A Bible is then put into his hands. I will admit that he is conscious of the existence of a God—All his works proclaim it. "Cœli enarrant gloriam Dei." But he can never ascertain of himself, from the book put into his hands, the religion which God has ordained. He must learn that from his Clergy or from Mr. Pope—I respect the Protestant Clergy—I acknowledge they possess the titulus coloratus. Mr. Pope, I should remark, is not sent, and St. Paul tells us that no one is to preach who is not called as Aaron was—"And how can they preach unless they be sent." The Protestant child, when the Bible is put into his hands cannot believe

in the infallibility of the translator—he cannot take the scriptures upon the authority of the Catholic church, he must disbelieve them altogether. The Protestant Clergy should beware of the principles so confidently put forth at the present period, and to which they lend their countenance and support. If every individual is to be constituted interpreter of the scriptures, the day will arrive when the clergy will be thrown overboard, and they will be glad to fly from the machinations of those who would make every old woman in the country an interpreter and expounder of the sacred word of God.

When Mr. Pope takes the Bible into his hands, he should prove that it is inspired. Granting that he establishes its authenticity, he has done nothing, if he cannot prove its inspiration. I defy him to do so upon his own principles, without being enclosed in a vicious circle. He receives the scriptures upon the reign of private judgment, and he then proves the divine right of private judgment from the scriptures. With regard to general councils, he wishes to know how many have been recognised in the church. If I be not able at this moment to state with numerical certainty the councils which are received, he will conclude that the church is not infallible. I tell him there have been eighteen ecumenical councils, whose definitions on articles of faith are held to be infallible. If Mr. Pope proves that any of the ecumenical councils have sanctioned any thing which contradicts the faith of the Catholic church, that indeed would be something like an unanswerable argument. He says that some councils are received in one diocess, and others in another.

There never was an ecumenical council held, but its doctrines were immediately received throughout the church. But it is not so with regard to local discipline. We affirm that it would be scandalous and unchristian to break communion, on account of differences in what is called local discipline. Mr. Pope dissents from the church of England, either in essentials, or he does not. If he differ in essentials, then there is no union in the Protestant churches. But if his cause of difference be not essential, he rends the seamless garment of Christ—he goes out of the ark of Noah without necessity, and separates without excuse from that general society of men—the Protestant church, and thus becomes a factious and dangerous member of society.—What says the Apostle Paul?

"I beseech that you walk worthy of the vocation in which you are called, with all humility and mildness, with patience, supporting one another in charity, careful to keep the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace. One body and one spirit; as you are called in one hope of your calling. One Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, who is above all and through all, and in us all."—*Epistle to the Ephesians*, iv, l. 2, 3, 4, 5, 6.

Are differences allowed here? Is the conduct of the heretics and reformers justified by this passage? They all set up their right of private judgment,—Arius, Luther, Calvin, Œcolampadius and Zuinglius, the last of whom affirms, that in the words "this is my body," the verb "IS" was used by Christ for REPRESENTS, contrary to the doctrine of Luther, by whom he was excommunicated.

The church of England says that good works are necessary; Mr. Pope denies that they are. Baptism with the sign of the cross is received in the church of England. Will he show me any authority from Scripture for that? We are told in scripture to keep holy the Sabbath day—Mr. Pope violates that commandment, by changing its object; or he must admit, that all things appertaining to salvation are not contained in the scriptures. He still sophistically endeavors to raise a difference between the church of Rome and the Catholic church. But I have shown from St. Augustin and many other Fathers, that the church of Christ is none other than the various Christian churches throughout the world in communion with the church of Rome. Mr. Pope quotes St. Paul, to show that the promises of Christ to his church were conditional. 'Tis well he admits that the promises were made, and it were better had he not attempted to prove them conditional. St. Paul, writing to the Gentiles dispersed at Rome, and who had been received into the church, warns them against vainly boasting of their election, and their having been preferred to the Jews. He tells them not to glory against the branches (meaning the Jews) who had been cut off through their incredulity, but rather to persevere in righteousness lest they should be cut off, and the Jews again engrafted. "If thou continue in his goodness (says he,) otherwise thou also shalt be cut off."

Mr. POPE rose and said,—My friend has touched on several topics, which more properly belong to the question to be discussed to-morrow. I shall, therefore, for the present pass them by, and proceed at once to my subject. He says that our Saviour did not give any command to write the scriptures. But if the sacred scriptures were not written by the command of God, then they cannot be inspired. He says, that I cannot show him any passages in the Bible, in which such a command is given—In the book of Exodus, xvii, 14, Douay version, I read.

"And the Lord said to Moses; *write this for a memorial in a book*, and deliver it to the ears of Josue, for I will destroy the memory of Amalec from under heaven."

Again, in the 101 psalm.—"Let these things *be written* unto another generation."

In the 30th Isaiah, 8 verse.—"Now, therefore, go in and *write* for them upon box, and note it diligently in a book, and *it shall be in the latter days for a testimony for ever.*"

Ezekiel, xliii, 11.—"Show them the form of the house, and of the fashion thereof, the goings-out, and the comings in, and the whole plan thereof, and all its ordinances, and all its order, and all its laws; and *thou shalt write* it in their sight, that they may keep the whole form thereof, and its ordinances, and do them."

Hab. ii, 2.—"And the Lord answered me, and said: *write* the vision and *make it plain upon tables: that he that readeth it, may run over it.*"

Rev. i, 11.—"What thou sayest, *write in a book:* and send to the seven churches which are in Asia."

19th verse of the same chapter.—"*Write* therefore the things which thou hast seen, and which are, and which must be done hereafter."

Chap. ii, 1.—"Unto the angel of the church of Ephesus, *write.*"

8 verse.—"And to the angel of the church of Smyrna, *write.*"

12 verse.—"And to the angel of the church of Pergamus, *write.*"

18 verse.—"And to the angel of the church of Thyatira, *write.*"

3 chap. 1st verse.—"And to the angel of the church of Sardis, *write.*"

7 verse.—"And to the angel of the church of Philadelphia, *write.*"

14 verse.—"And to the angel of the church of Laodicea, *write.* These things saith the Amen, the faithful and true witness, who is the beginning of the creation of God."

Here then are the *express* commands of our Saviour himself, for writing at least particular portions of the word of God. We shall now see what are the opinions of Fathers upon the subject St. Augustin, de Consens. Evang. lib. i, cap, 7, says,

"This first is to be discussed, which some are accustomed to object to—why the Lord himself wrote nothing? Pagans chiefly start this objection."

And further, in the same book and 25th chap. he says:

"When they (meaning the evangelists) wrote what he showed and said, it is by no means to be inferred, that he himself did not write; since he as the head, dictated what his members put down; for whatsoever he wished that we should know of his deeds or sayings, he commanded to be written as by his own hands."

And Gregory the Great (in Præfat. in lib. Job.)

"If having received letters from some great man, we read the words, and should demand with what pen these words were written: this, indeed, would be most ridiculous, to trouble ourselves inquiring, not so much who was the author? or what was his name? as with what pen the words were written?" "When, therefore, we believe the substance of the letters, and acknowledge the Holy Spirit to be the author of the matter, if we should set about inquiring for the scribe, what else are we doing than, if after reading letters we should vainly trouble our heads about the pen they were written with."

And the same author says (Epist. lib. iv, indict. xii, ep. 31. Paris, 1705,)

"What are the holy scriptures, but a certain epistle from the omnipotent God to his creatures."

And Athanasius, in Rescript ad Liber. tom. i, speaking of Christ, says:

"He it is who has spoken by the prophets—He it is who has composed the Old and New Testament."

My learned friend made some observations on the quotation from Dupin. The opinions of Dupin are clear and distinct upon the subject; and you have only to contrast his observations with those of my friend, to convince you. that the Roman Catholic church was not in primitive times acknowledged as the universal church. He also referred to that passage in the creed where it is said, "I believe in the Holy Catholic church." The creed, I admit, is an ancient document; and were I even to grant that it was penned by the Apostles, Mr. Maguire need not have given himself the trouble of proving, that the universal church of Christ was called the Catholic church. I admit this at once; but I deny as distinctly that this term applied to the church of Rome; and until Mr. Maguire proves this, I maintain that his other arguments go for nothing. I know my friend attaches great importance to the authority of the Fathers, and I shall now allude to a passage from Tertullian which was referred to in my letter to Mr. Maguire. In order to secure Christians in true doctrine, he recommends them to consult the Apostolic churches, mentioning the churches of Corinth, of Philippi, of Thessalonica, and of Ephesus, as well as of Rome.—*Tertul. de præscrip. ad Hær.* § 14, *p.* 108, 109.

Now I would ask, had Tertullian considered that the church of Rome was the universal church, or that she maintained an authority over other churches, would he have written thus? Would he have spoken of other churches in the same strain in which he speaks of the church of Rome—had he considered her as the supreme or universal church? Truly Tertullian did not place her in so high a rank as my friend would have us to suppose. In relation to this passage which I have quoted, the Roman Catholic writer, Beatus Rhenanus remarks, that "if Tertullian were to utter such a sentiment in his day, relative to the church of Rome, he would not escape punishment." Rhenan. Argum. in Tert. de Præc. et alibi. Impres. Basil, 1521. *I could multiply many quotations from the Fathers to the same purport, but that I wish to occupy my time with other matter.*

In the Council of Chalcedon it was decreed, that equal respect should be paid to the Bishops of Constantinople and Rome. And I would ask, can any thing more distinctly prove, that the church of Rome was not in the earlier ages looked upon exclusively the church of Christ? Or can any thing more directly contradict the assumption of universal authority claimed by that church? But I would also ask my friend, if the church of Rome was in the first ages considered as the supreme or universal church, how does it happen, that the Apostle Paul addressed epistles to several churches without the most distant reference to the authority of the church of Rome; and

that, in the epistle which he addressed to the church of Rome, he does not make the most indirect allusion to her being the Catholic or supreme Church, much less to her possessing the prerogative of infallibility? Nor is the epistle even addressed to Peter, who is said to have been the first Bishop of Rome. On the contrary, we find the epistle addressed "to all," (mark that) "to all that are at Rome, the beloved of God, called to be saints." There is not one word, you perceive, about the boasted supremacy of that Church—nor the least mention of the Apostle Peter. It is addressed to all those who composed the church of Christ in that city. Where, then, I would ask, is there the slightest ground of argument to show that the church of Rome was the supreme church? I assert, that Mr. Maguire has not established his opinion on this subject; while on the contrary, it must be evident to every one present, from the passages which I have quoted from scripture, and from the Father, also, that no such doctrine was entertained in the first ages of the church. My friend has brought forward the word "consubstantial," to show that words have been introduced, which are not to be found in scripture; and argues that the term Roman Catholic may be also admitted, though not found in sacred writ. I allow that there are many words used by theologians which are not to be found in scripture, but deny that this makes for his argument. The terms which theologians use, do not contradict themselves; but I appeal to common sense, is there not an evident contradiction in the term Roman Catholic? To speak of a particular universal, I maintain, is absurd—"Where the true church was before Luther," and the Pope's supremacy, I shall consider, when we come to the question of the Reformation.

My friend has referred to the passage which I quoted from St. Augustin, pointing out the method by which we might discover the true church of Christ. I confess that I was not a little surprised at his commentary on that passage. If, however, he admits that St. Augustin held that the scriptures were to be referred to in contentions with reputed heretics,—as the church of Rome considers me a heretic, she should condescend to refer me for the discovery of the marks of the true church to the same authority. St. Augustin again says, "I am unwilling that the church be demonstrated by human documents but by divine oracles."—(*De Unitat. Eccles.* c. 3.)

I did not cite "where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them," to prove the invisibility of the church of Christ;—nor did I argue that two or three constituted the universal church. What I said was, that the church of Christ, or the universal church, consisted of *the*

entire body of the faithful, however scattered over the world—and the Great Head of the Church had promised, that wherever two or three were assembled together in his name he would be with them to bless them and to preside over them. My friend has alluded to the promise made by Christ, "he shall guide you into *all* truth." But he should remember, that while some of the promises refer to the great body of those who compose the church of Christ, others were intended especially for the Apostles. In a succeeding chapter we find Christ promised the Comforter, "*to bring to their remembrance all that he has spoken.*" We cannot say that we heard Christ speak *viva voce*, as the Apostles did. And therefore it will be seen, that there are some of the promises which cannot apply to any but to them. My friend says, "he was quits with me on the Fathers." Now, I affirm, that the passages which I quoted from their writings, went distinctly to prove, that in the early ages, neither the infallibility, the supremacy, nor the universality of the church of Rome was acknowledged. Should I grant, however that Mr. Maguire "was quits with me, in reference to the Fathers," what does the concession amount to? That we have Fathers against Fathers—and how shall we in the midst of such uncertainty, if we depend on them, be able to come to any specific conclusion? I therefore do trust, that the result of the present discussion may be, that we shall throw the Fathers overboard, and sailing in the ark of the living God, his holy scriptures, launch out upon the great ocean of religious truth. My friend has said, that the version of the scriptures which contains the pure word of God, is that translated by Jerome, and sanctioned by the council of Trent. The council of Trent pronounced an edition of the Vulgate, that *was afterwards to be* published "quam emendatissime," as correctly as possible—the standard edition. She pronounced a verdict upon an edition at the time, *in utero*, that had not seen the light. An edition of the Vulgate was published by the Louvain doctors, about thirty years after the council of Trent. Pope Sixtus V. not approving of this edition, and wishing for a still more correct one, with great trouble brought together many learned Jewish and Roman Catholic doctors—the Vulgate was compared with the Greek and Hebrew originals, and the edition was completed. Sixtus considered it so perfect, that in his preface he declared, that any one who should attempt to alter it "in minimâ particulâ," should be subject to the major excommunication. Within three years after the publication of this immaculate and infallible edition, written as it was in a dead language, and therefore less liable to suffer from the variations to which a living language is subject, another made its appearance under the sanction of

Pope Clement VIII. And what think you? Notwithstanding the anathema which Pope Sixtus had pronounced on the individual who should, "in minimâ particulâ," in the least particle alter the edition published by him, it has been ascertained that there were in the edition published by Clement VIII, no fewer than 2000 variations from the text of the Sixtine edition. Dr. James has proved the existence of these differences between the Clementine and Sixtine editions, in his work entitled Bellum Papale. Now, I would ask my learned friend, from which of these editions has the version, which he represents to be so immaculate, been taken? I answer, from the Clementine edition and not from the Sixtine. So that Pope Clement VIII, and the Douay translators have incurred the penalty pronounced in the preface of the Sixtine edition—have subjected themselves to 2000 majores excommunicationes. But this is not all. In the successive editions of the Douay version are to be found many discrepancies. If the present edition, of whose correctness my learned friend has made such unwarrantable boast, be compared with the Clementine and Sixtine editions, it will be found to differ not only from both the Sixtine and Clementine, but also from preceding editions of itself, as Mr. Hamilton has clearly shown. I should mention that Clement bought up the Sixtine copies to guard, if possible, his predecessor from the charge of fallibility, so that but two copies, I believe, are extant. Thus, we have Pope against Pope, and doctor against doctor. I again ask my friend to produce a perfect and immaculate copy of the scriptures. I have shown you that he cannot do so. Then we have to charge his infallible church, either with having failed in her duty towards her people, in not having provided a perfect edition of God's holy word; or, on the other hand, with inability to produce such a translation of the scriptures. Let my friend adopt either alternative; and I ask, what becomes of the boasted infallibility of his church? He desired me to produce a perfect version of the Bible—I affirm, that although we do not boast of infallibility, we have a better version of the scriptures than his church can produce. I need not here occupy your time in speaking of the extreme pains and care, which were taken by men of the greatest talents and research, in preparing the present authorised version.

Dr. Geddes, who was, at least at one period of his life, a Roman Catholic priest, a man of considerable literary attainments, has spoken of the Protestant Bible in terms of the greatest commendation. He observes,—

"The highest eulogiums have been made on the translation of James I, both by our own writers and by foreigners. And, indeed, if accuracy fidelity, and the strictest attention to the letter of the text be supposed to

form the qualifications of an excellent version, this, of all versions, must in general be accounted the most excellent. Every sentence, every word, every syllable, every letter and point, seem to have been weighed with the nicest exactitude, and expressed, either in the text, or margin, with the greatest precision. Pagninus himself is hardly more literal; and it was well observed by Robinson, above 100 years ago, that 'it may serve for a lexicon of the Hebrew language as well as for a translation.'"

Hear the opinion of the celebrated J. K. L.* on the subject He says, "The authorised version is a noble work, with all its faults." We see, therefore, from the testimony of Roman Catholics, that our version of the scriptures is truly excellent; and in confirmation of its great value, I beg to remark, that each succeeding edition of the Douay Bible approximates nearer and nearer to the Protestant version. And is not this circumstance an acknowledgment, that the Protestant version is considered, even by the Roman Catholic hierarchy, as more accurate than their own?

Mr. MAGUIRE.—I deny that our bible has approximated to the English edition. I deny the fact—let Mr. Pope prove it, and then show how, and in what manner, it has been effected. The apostle St. John is desired to write what he has seen "in a book, and send it to the seven churches which are in Asia, to Ephesus, and Smyrna, and to Pergamos, and to Thyatira, and to Sardis, and to Philadelphia, and to Laodicea." So far the apostle is commanded to write to the particular bishops of particular churches, conveying particular information. But from this a general conclusion is drawn by Mr. Pope that our Saviour commanded the New Testament to be written. The Apostle is commanded to write to the *angel* of the *church* of *Ephesus*, and from this Mr. Pope draws the unjust and illogical conclusion, that a positive commandment has been given to write the New Testament. I come now to his argument drawn from the Sixtine and Clementine editions of the Bible. I may premise that the Pope's infallibility is not a doctrine of mine, nor of any Catholic. There are differences on the subject between the French and ultra Montanists, but they are merely the private opinions of private divines. The church has pronounced no opinion on it. The church only pronounces on essentials. It leaves the human mind free to discuss other subjects respecting which infallibility does not shut out inquiry—but the authority of the church is decisive in articles of faith, which cannot be ascertained by human power. How could the mass of mankind be able to judge of the truth of the doctrine of the Trinity or of justification by faith? how could they reconcile with a just God the doctrine of original sin? And what is the human

* Right Reverend James Doyle, Bishop of Kildare and Leighlin.

mind? Is not the great mass of mankind composed of the ignorant and lower orders? It is only when every man is allowed to read and interpret the Bible, that

"A little learning is a dangerous thing."

Christianity is thrown overboard, and the church of Christ is scoffed at. It was by such means that infidelity spread throughout France and Germany. It is our duty to read the Bible, but it must be under proper circumstances. I love the Bible—I read the Bible—I believe it to be the infallible Word of God. Christ will not allow his children to use good food, when, by the circumstances of the case, it might be converted into poison. Would you give to a child food of an indigestible quality? The Catholic church, knowing from experience the danger of an indiscriminate perusal of the scriptures, directs that the sacred volume should not be read by any who want the due disposition. The Catholic church is right in resisting the indiscriminate reading of the scriptures. If the Bible be at all imperfect, as Mr. Pope has been endeavouring to prove it, that would be a strong argument that it should not be put into the hands of the ignorant and illiterate without due caution. Mr. Pope quotes the authority of Pope Sixtus, that the scriptures shall not be altered from his edition, "*ne in minima particula.*"

The Catholic divines, who wrote the catechism of the council, state, that Catholic *doctrine* shall not be changed *ne in minima particula.* Allusion is here made by the Pope to the faith conveyed in the book, and not to matters of discipline In faith we yield to the authority of the church, which, as the holy Fathers say, is the solution of all difficulties. I will here call on Mr. Pope to compare the Sixtine and Clementine editions of the Bible with the Latin Vulgate, and see if he can find any thing in them as to substance and faith different. He talks of his Bible—it has undergone more substantial changes than any book in the world. There have been upwards of 7000 corrections made by Dr. Mills. Dr. Wharton was charged with promoting infidelity, having made such a skeleton of the Bible. Ward has proved the numerous corruptions in the Protestant Bible. Take an example—in the nineteenth chapter of Numbers, Moses is directed to take the ashes of a heifer that has been sacrificed, and to sprinkle them with the water of expiation—lest this text might go to sanction holy water, it is translated the "water of separation" in the Protestant Bible—although in all ancient copies, it is either the water of lustration, purification, or aspersion. "A man," says Dr. Wall, another restorer of the Protestant Bible, "cannot forbear having a strong stomach against our translators, who, with all the ancient copies before them, must nevertheless go astray."

Luther, quoting the words of St. Paul,

"For we believe that a man may be saved by faith, without the works of the law," (alluding to the Jewish law) adds to the text the word 'only;' in the German '*allein.*'

And when upbraided with this sacrilegious addition, he replied,

'Am I not an apostle, as well as Paul—and should any Papist object to the word *only*, immediately oppose to him the *will* of Dr. Martin Luther, who is a doctor above all Popish doctors, and who asserts, that the Pope and an ass are synonymous terms —*quid unum et idem.*"

I hold myself responsible for the Vulgate. I challenge him to show me a material error in that translation. I receive it upon the authority of an infallible church. Mr. Pope will acknowledge no authority—he sets up his opinion not only against the Catholic, but against the Protestant churches. The Catholic church has preserved the authentic copy of the scriptures—from it the Protestant church has received it. Mr. Pope, however, denies any church possesses *any* authority to which *any* man is obliged to yield. I shall read to you a passage from St. Chrysostom. He says,—

"If you wage war against man you may conquer, or be overcome; no force shall overcome the church. The church is much stronger than the earth—even stronger than heaven—for 'Heaven and earth shall pass away,' (Luke xxi, 33.) What words are these, '*the gates of hell shall not prevail against her?*' (Matt. xvi, 18.) But if you doubt the word—give credit to facts. How many tyrants have assailed the church of God—how many torments—what persecutions—what fires? They could effect nothing." *Homily de Expulsione sua*, tome iv, p. 843.

And in his Homily, "*Quod Christus sit deus*," tome v, chap 11—he says,—

"'On this rock I will build my church.'—(Matt. xvi, 18.) Consider what this means, and you will discover its evident truth, for it is not alone wonderful that Christ built his church in all parts of the earth, but that he rendered her impregnable, and invincible against all attacks—'The gates of hell shall not prevail against her'—that is, no danger—not those that produce death, and lead to hell. Have you witnessed this prediction? Have you beheld the certainty and strength of the event? Have you seen the words manifested in the fact, and the power, which without arms accomplished all things?"

I now come again to the distinction which Mr. Pope has endeavoured to draw between the Catholic church and the Roman Catholic church—it is a mere play upon words; the Fathers, he asserts, did not allow the church of Rome to be the Catholic church. I have already told you, that in consequence of the separation of the Greek church, and the heresy of the Arians, the Catholic church was then for the first time, and as a distinctive mark, called the *Roman* Catholic church, and it included all the churches in the west, and throughout the world, in communion with the see of Rome. This is the church of which St. Augustin says, *Contra Epistolam Fundamenti*—

"I would not believe the gospel, if the authority of the Catholic church did not move me thereto."

And in his book *De Symbolo*,

"This is the holy church—the one church—the Catholic church—the true church, which contending against all heresies may herself be assailed, but cannot be overcome. All heresies have gone out from her, like useless branches cut off from the vine—she herself remaining fixed to the root—fixed to the stock—fixed in charity, and against which the '*gates of hell shall not prevail.*'"

But as to the distinction between the church of Rome and the Catholic church, it was unknown to St. Augustin, unless when he happened to speak of the diocess of Rome. This I have shown in a former quotation, where he holds a succession from the chair of Peter, to whom Christ committed the care of the whole flock, to be absolutely necessary. And St. Jerome, in his letter to Pope Damascus, says,—

"To thee I know were given the keys of the kingdom of heaven. Whosoever gathereth not with thee scattereth—that is, he that is not Christ's is antichrist's."

And again he says,

"I could dry up all the streams of your argument with one ray of that sun which shines upon the church."

Irenæus is equally strong upon the very same point. Mr. Pope and I are at variance with respect to the interpretation of a particular text. Mr. Pope says that every man should follow his private judgment. I maintain he should submit to the authority of the church. Mr. Pope then appeals to the text. Let him make the Bible speak. (Here Mr. Maguire laid his finger upon the Bible.) It is a poor rule of faith, truly, if it cannot decide. If he succeeds in making the Bible speak, I shall be converted to his opinions; but if the Bible remain mute, he should not set up as a rule of faith, a book which cannot pronounce a decision. According to my principles, the church is to judge, that is to decide, upon matters of faith. The scriptures are the rule of our conduct—the church interpreting the scriptures is the rule of our faith. The scriptures we reverence and venerate, just as we do the images of Christ and his saints. The royal prophet laughed at the gods of the Gentiles, because they *could not speak;* those who make the scriptures the sole judge of controversies, expose them to similar contempt, because at the best, they are but a dumb judge, and consequently unable to pronounce.

Mr. Pope says, Catholics believe articles of faith which are not in the scriptures. Protestants also believe many articles of faith not to be found in the sacred volume. There are articles of faith not explicitly revealed. Our Saviour himself tells his

disciples, that he has many more things to say to them, which they are not as yet able to bear; but he promises at the same time to send the Holy Ghost, who would instruct them in all things. Their weak minds might have been shocked by the too sudden revelation of divine truths. If such was the caution observed by *Christ* towards his *apostles*, how much more ought it to be observed towards the *poor* and *ignorant* of mankind? Mr. Pope endeavors to gloss over the fooleries and fanaticism generated by the principles which he advocates. But it is evident that the ignorant, the unlearned, and the weak-minded, who form the great majority of mankind, can alone proceed safely, when conducted by a living guide. If they be allowed to frame a rule of faith for themselves, embark without chart or compass upon the wide ocean of opinion—if they are allowed to think upon matters of faith as they please, the result will be, they will give way to prejudice and passion, and substitute their own judgment for the revelation of Jesus Christ. When Mr. Pope hands the Bible to the poor and ignorant Protestant, how can he know that it is the word of God. When the Protestant arrives at the years of discretion he must receive it from his parents, from some clergyman, or from Mr. Pope, and the only reason he can assign for his believing it is, that he received it from them or from Mr. Pope. Let the other rule be examined, and let the common sense of mankind judge whether it is not the better. The child receives the scriptures upon the authority of that church in reference to which St. Augustin said, "I would not receive the gospels, unless upon the authority of the Catholic church." I may here remark, that there were at one time in circulation nine spurious copies of the gospel of St Matthew, each pretending to be the true original. The apostolical churches were then consulted, and the *genuine* copy ascertained. The church pronounced her decision, upon which St. Augustin *rested his faith*. If Mr. Pope insists upon the scriptures being the sole rule of faith, then why does he not wash his neighbor's feet? As the Lord says to his disciples, "If I, being Lord and Master, have washed your feet; you also ought to wash one another's feet." If he cannot show me that this is not a commandment, let him show me why he does not continue to obey it. Let him also justify from scripture the change in the observance of the Sabbath.

Mr. POPE rose and said:—Gentlemen—my learned friend has asked, when *we* are individually all fallible, by what process can we arrive at an infallible decision? I ask my friend the same question. He has told us, that he believes the Pope to be fallible, and all the bishops and priests of the Romish church to

be fallible. Now, I should wish to know by what method they who according to Mr. Maguire's own confession are all fallible, can become infallible? He tells me, that if my doctrines be admitted, a young child must remain an Atheist until he arrives at years of discretion. Now, what do I find the scriptures saying on this subject? "Train up a child in the way he should go, and when he is old he will not depart therefrom." The Psalmist declares, "that out of the mouths of babes and sucklings God has perfected praise:" and the Saviour remarks, that "the things which are hidden from the wise and prudent, are revealed unto babes." I readily admit, that, in the first instance, in a great degree, the faith of the Protestant child, as to the authenticity and inspiration of the scriptures, must rest on the veracity of the parent. And I ask Mr. Maguire, is not this the case with the children of Roman Catholics? How can a Roman Catholic child believe that the church of Rome is infallible, or that she possesses any authority, unless the child receives these opinions on the authority of the parent?

Do we, in point of fact, find more Atheists among the children of Protestants than among those of the Roman Catholic communion? Let facts decide. But my friend says, I argue in a vicious circle, because I prove the inspiration and authority of the sacred scriptures by the right of private judgment, and maintain the right of every man to exercise his judgment by the authority of the scriptures. But this exercise of the judgment is an inherent right, implanted in man by the God of Heaven, to whom we are accountable. There is no other way given of discovering truth. We possess a natural right to exercise our judgments on the contents of any document purporting to be a revelation from God. The Apostles themselves appealed to the judgments of men. There is no other mode of deciding upon the authority of the scriptures, but by the exercise of private judgment. And a subsequent appeal to the inspired oracles *in confirmation* of the right of private judgment, does not militate against the laws of sound reasoning. I deny, therefore, that I argued in a vicious circle. But, on the contrary, I assert, that this was the case with my friend, Mr. Maguire. What were the arguments which he made use of to show the authority of his Church? When asked to prove her authority, he refers to the scriptures; and when again requested to prove the authority of the scriptures, he refers to the church. Just as if I were (to give you a familiar illustration) to take two books, and place the one upon the other—thus.—(Here Mr. Pope taking two books gave a practical illustration of his meaning.) The same part cannot be at once the superstructure and the foundation. If the church gives authority to the scriptures,

then the authority of the church must be independent of the scriptures; and we cannot appeal to the scriptures in support of her authority. If the scriptures give authority to the church the authority of the scriptures must be independent of the authority of the church; and we cannot appeal to the church in support of their authority. My learned friend has asked me for my creed. I have given it; and now return the question upon himself. He would, no doubt, tell me that he believed whatever the church has decreed. This you will find is an exceedingly indefinite reply. My friend agreed with Delahogue in his Tractatus de Ecclesiâ, that there are eighteen general councils; but he was not *quite* certain as to the number, nor did he attempt to specify the peculiar characteristics necessary to designate a council as general. You perceive, therefore, when I ask Mr. Maguire for his confession of faith, he has to refer to general councils; and yet at the same time he cannot state, by what mark a general council can be distinguished from others: while I appeal for my creed to certain well-defined articles, and to the Bible as the ground-work of the Christian faith. Now, I would ask, whose creeds is the most defined—mine, which is contained in the book of God, the Bible; or Mr. Maguire's, who refers you to general councils, of the authority of some of which doubts are entertained; and to the unanimous consent of the Fathers, scattered through a multitude of ponderous folios? I affirm, that I do not differ in any essential point of faith from the church of England, or from any Protestant communion. I think, however, my reverend friends of the Establishment will doubtless feel much obliged to Mr. Maguire for his application of the Ark of Noah to the church of England. Mr. Maguire has stated, that we cannot find any authority in the scriptures for keeping the first day of the week instead of the seventh. I answer, that we find, that the disciples assembled together on two successive first days, after the Saviour rose from the dead.—(John, xx, 19, 26.) In Acts, xx, 7, we are told, that on the first day of the week the disciples met together to break bread. And in 1 Cor. xvi, 2, the practice appears to be confirmed. Such then was the custom of the Apostle and the other disciples, as recorded in holy writ. We now follow their example. My learned opponent has asked, if the Bible be the rule of faith and practice, and that we are bound to obey it, why do I not wash my brother's feet, as commanded by our Lord to do so? Now, I reply, that were I in an eastern country, I would do so with readiness. We all are aware, that in eastern countries, on account of the great heat, it is regarded as an act of kindness to assist a guest who may have travelled from a distance, in taking off his sandals,

and in presenting water for his feet: but as this clima e is temperate, my judgment leads me to suppose, that I am not called upon to "wash the feet of my neighbor." With respect to the passages which I quoted from the Apocalypse, I beg to say, that I did not quote them partially; the quotations, when consulted, will decide. I did not argue from a particular to a universal. I merely showed, that there were *distinct* commands given for writing at least portions of the word of life; and these commands are recorded for our instruction. With respect to the Clementine edition, I assert, that the Douay version is from the Clementine, and that consequently the translators have subjected themselves to the penalties imposed by Sixtus.

My friend has said, that neither *he himself*, nor scarcely *any one else believes in the infallibility of the Pope*. Need I again say, that the Italians believe implicitly in the infallibility of the Pope? Cardinal Bellarmine says,

"If the Pope could or should so far err as to command the practice of vice, and to forbid virtuous actions, the church were bound to believe vices to be good, and virtues to be bad!!"—De Pontiff. Rom. lib. iv, cap. 5. *in fin.*

Cardinal Zabarelli informs us, that

"The Pope can do all things, whatsoever he pleases, even unlawful things, *and is more than God!!*"—De Schism. Sul. Serm. Script. p. 70.

Masonnus says,

"That the Roman Pontiffs cannot even sin without praise!!"—Lib. in Vit. Johanni IX.

My friend told me, that the divines in the church of Rome are allowed to exercise their private judgment on matters of discipline. I am glad to hear it, and I trust the same privilege will also be granted to the people. He asks me, how is a poor man to decide, when I hand him the Bible, whether it is really inspired or not? I briefly answer, when I hand the scriptures to a person in the humbler walks of life, should he express any doubt of their inspiration, I would say to him—"Read this blessed volume, and you will discover in it proofs, that it has come from God."

I now ask my friend in reply, how is the peasant to examine the many ponderous volumes which contain the councils of the church of Rome? And without such examination, how can he *truly* ascertain the opinions of his church? This question appears to me infinitely more perplexing than that proposed by Mr. Maguire. We do not assert that the authorized Bible is immaculate, but maintain, that it fully gives "the mind of the spirit," *quoad fidem et mores*, as to matters of faith and morals. We find the Saviour and his Apostles quoting from the Septuagint, which was not immaculate, a circumstance that may render

as satisfied with translations, though not absolutely perfect. Sixtus speaks not only of *Clausu'a* and *Periodus*, but also of *minima particula*. Compare the Clementine and Sixtine editions of the scriptures, and it is clear the Douay doctors considered the Clementine the better of the two, since that is the edition which they have followed. That discrepancies exist between the Sixtine and Clementine editions, is a matter of notoriety amongst theologians. With respect to justification by faith alone, he refers to Luther; but I would refer him to the epistle written to the church which he claims as his own, the church of Rome. In the third chapter of the Romans, and 20th verse, it is said, "We account a man to be justified by faith without the works of the law." He charges me with denying the importance of good works. I distinctly assert, that I desire to witness the fruits of righteousness universally exhibited; but I hold that the only mode of laying the foundation of morality, is to proclaim justification by faith in the Son of God. No other doctrine can touch the heart, or withdraw it from the love of the world. A Christian lives not to himself, but to him who died and rose again, that he might be Lord both of the dead and living. Fixing his eye on Calvary, he sees the evidence of his own sin, and the redeeming mercy of his Saviour. Though deeply feeling his own unworthiness, through the blood of Jesus he is freed from embarrassing anxiety—and as an adopted son—can pour out his soul before him; for "God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish but have everlasting life." He desires to count all things but loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus, and grounds his hopes of acceptance exclusively on his merits. He is enabled, in some humble measure, to run in the way of his commandments, because he feels himself not to be his own, but Christ's—by creation and redemption, purchased by the blood of the Lamb, and therefore bound, by interest as well as gratitude, to dedicate himself, body, soul, and spirit, to the glory of God, which is his reasonable service.

My friend has desired me to point out a passage in the Vulgate, in which there is a single error, or which differs in the slightest particular from the originals. I shall refer him to the passage in the 11th of Hebrews, where the Apostle says, that "Jacob worshipped, leaning on the top of his staff," προσεκυνησεν επι το ακρον της ἑαυτου ραβδου or, as the words are in the Vulgate, "*adoravit cacumen virgæ ejus*," or, in the Douay Bible, "adored the top of his rod." St. Jerome does not agree with the interpretation received by the church of Rome.—(Quæs. Hebr. in Genes. Erasm. Edit. vol. vi, p. 228.) In

proof that the church of Rome has not furnished an authorized and immaculate commentary, hear the opinion of Dr. Doyle, in answer to a question, before the Lord's committee.

"You consider yourselves pledged to all matters contained in these notes? —No, not by any means; on the contrary, there were notes affixed, I believe, to the Rhemish Testament, which were most objectionable; and, on being presented to us, we caused them to be expunged. THE NOTES CARRY, IN OUR EDITIONS OF THE BIBLE, NO WEIGHT; for we do not know the writers of many of them. If we find them clear enough in explanation of doctrine, we leave them there; but whenever we find any thing exceptionable, we put them out, as we have done in the cases I have referred to."—*Dr. Doyle's Evidence before the House of Lords*, p. 222.

I assert then, that we have strong proofs against the infallibility of the church of Rome; inasmuch as she has not been able to furnish a *perfect* edition of the scriptures—nor a standard commentary—except we choose to take the unanimous consent of the Fathers, as contained in the numberless and massy volumes that have emanated from their pens! My friend has talked of a ray of light which would dry up all the streams of Protestant opinion—I wish he would now suffer that ray to beam upon us. If he be able to produce such a light, is it not uncharitable in my reverend friend to allow us any longer to remain in the state of darkness of which he speaks? But my friend has also brought forward the numbers attached to his church as a proof of her universality. Numbers, permit me to say, are no proof of truth. If such, however, be regarded as a proof of universality and infallibility, the church of Rome cannot be the universal or infallible church. It has been ascertained, that there are at present seventy-five millions of Protestants, and, in addition, fifty millions belonging to the Greek church, who also protest against the church of Rome. Now the aggregate of these is one hundred and twenty-five millions; while the number belonging to the Roman Catholic church amounts to but ninety millions. So that we perceive, even in point of numbers, this wonderfully infallible and universal church, when weighed in the balance, is found wanting.

Mr. Maguire has asserted, that the Bible is a dumb judge, and unable to pronounce—yet we find that the Saviour considered it competent to decide; for he again and again appealed to the Old Testament scriptures—"Had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed me, for he *wrote* of me."

It is worthy of observation, that Bellarmine (de Conciliis, 1, i, ch. 6,) gives us a list of general councils *partly confirmed* and *partly rejected*; and (in c. 7, and Rom. Pont. 1, iv, c. 11,) he says, that several things in those councils allowed to be general were foisted in by heretics—he knows not how. My learned opponent is correct, according to Delahogue, as to the numbers

of general councils—but strange to say, Delahogue himself admits, that there is a division respecting the council of Constance—all Catholics, he observes, confess that as to *some* of its sessions it was ecumenical; the Italians deny that it was ecumenical as to all its sessions, while the French church vigorously maintain the directly opposite opinion.—Tract de Eccles. p. 451.)

Again, Delahogue (p. 452,) acknowledges the uncertainty existing respecting the 5th Lateran council, and quotes the following passage from Bellarmine:

"It remains a question among Catholics to the present day, whether the 5th Lateran be truly a general Council."—(L. ii, de Conc. c. 13.)

I beg to remark, that Delahogue must include the council of Constance, or the 5th Lateran, in order to complete the number of eighteen general councils. And yet with all the assistance of an infallible church, he has not told us which of the two he has adopted, not having prefixed any number to either. Therefore, another infallible tribunal is called for, to determine which councils are general, and which are not; and an infallible depository is required to preserve the councils, according to Bellarmine, from the interpolations of heretics! I would ask, is it the character of the council which is to decide the orthodoxy of the doctrine, or the orthodoxy of the doctrine the character of the council? If the former, who is to decide upon the characteristics of a general council? If the latter, why is not the council of Tyra, held in the 6th century, received as general, as well as the first council of Nice—both having been summoned by imperial authority? Was not the 5th council assembled at Constantinople in despite of the opposition of Pope Vigilius? Did not that council condemn as heretical, three books, against the express prohibition of Vigilius—the one by Ibas, Bishop of Edessa, the other of Theodorus of Mopsuestia, and the other of Theodoret, Bishop of Cyrus? And yet was not that very council in the end approved of by the successors of Vigilius, and, in fine, received throughout all the church as a true and ecumenical council? (Vide Baronium in Justiniano et Vigilo, tom. vii, et Sirmundum Præfat, in secund.) All this doubt and confusion carry upon them *prima facie* evidence, that the church of Rome is destitute of infallibility.

I now solemnly put it to Mr. Maguire's conscience, will he stand to every thing which is decreed in general councils? I am satisfied that he will not. In the 27th canon of the 3rd Lateran council, the persecution of heretics is recommended. It is decreed (3 Lat. council, can. 16,) that "oaths are to be regarded as perjuries *which militate against ecclesiastical utility* and the institutes of the holy Fathers." Will Mr. Maguire, I say,

stand to such decrees? He cannot; he will not. What then becomes of the infallibility of general councils in his estimation?

Again—we have had contradictions the most opposite. The council of Constance deposed three Popes and declared the papal authority was subject to a council. We may differ about the signification of passages in the scripture, but we can appeal to common sense—to the context—or to the analogy of faith—but we cannot appeal to an infallible tribunal to decide—for the existence of such a tribunal is the matter in debate. But facts can speak—council is against council—Pope against Pope. The church of Rome has not yet been able to decide as to the seat of her supposed infallibility; and, by referring me to the unanimous consent of the Fathers to discover the doctrines of scripture, bids me to waste my life in wandering through their ponderous folios. Facts, such as these, lead me at once to conclude, that the church of Rome is not infallible.

Mr. Maguire—I have first a few words to say in reply to Mr. Pope. He has endeavored, but in vain, to get over the difficulty which I called upon him to solve, namely, how a Protestant child could receive the Bible as the inspired word of God. The child could only receive the scriptures upon the private judgment, or the authority of the minister. If he receive the scriptures upon that authority, and that such authority be recognised by Mr. Pope, then the question is settled. Mr. Pope endeavored to illustrate his argument by placing one book on the top of another, and he gets out of the circle in which he is involved by upsetting both books. I defied Mr. Pope to point out an error regarding matters of faith in the Latin Vulgate. He appealed to a passage in Hebrews where he asserts it is said of Jacob, "adoravit cacumen virgæ ejus." Now in the first place, the quotation is false and the Latin is bad—the words are, "fastigium virgæ ejus."—The controversy here is about the Greek word επι. It signifies towards the top of the staff, as well as the top of the staff. The latter is the better translation—every man who knows Greek, knows the Greek word will bear both meanings. This passage has been very ably discussed by Dr. Lingard who is fully qualified to sustain it. I can assure the learned gentlemen, that he is very far, in this instance, from proving the existence of an error in the Latin Vulgate. I said that no Catholic is bound to believe in the infallibility of the pope; and I re-assert, that it does not form an article of Catholic faith. Divines have had, and may still have their private quarrels about it. But such differences form no breach of communion, as the subject matter in dispute, forms no article of Catholic faith. "Upon this rock" says our

Saviour, "I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall no prevail against her." Here is the infallibility promised by our Lord, and claimed by the Catholic church, and not the infallibility of the pope, which my learned adversary would cram down the throats of Catholics, "velint nolint"—as an article of Catholic faith.

I called upon Mr. Pope to produce any ecumenical council which contradicted another in matters of faith. It is strange that he should quote what he has quoted regarding the taking of an oath. I affirm that every oath should be taken in truth and justice, and in judgment. No man should swear to any thing for which he has not the evidence of his senses, or a certainty approaching to mathematical precision. A person who would swear *contra statuta patrum*, would not, undoubtedly, have such evidence to sustain his oath. I repeat in the face of the learned world, that what Mr. Pope has quoted from the councils, forms no part of their decision upon matters of faith. When a council decides upon matters of faith, it employs a certain invariable form—"*Si quis dixerit*," "If any person shall say," &c,—"*anathema sit*," "let him be anathema." When this form is employed, the decision is upon an article of faith—I told you already there were eighteen ecumenical councils.—They never issued an anathema in the above form, where an article of faith was not concerned. But, in matters not connected with faith or essential morality, a council may err. The infallibility of general councils extends only to matters of faith and essential discipline. The promise which Christ made to his church was, that she should never teach error. Our articles of faith are well known. I defy any one to produce me a general council which has contradicted another general council in matters of faith.

Mr. Pope speaks vauntingly of seventy-five millions of Protestants. Where are they? They do not exist—unless, indeed, you collect under the broad standard of Protestantism many sects, who differ more from each other than I do from my friend, Mr. Pope. I ask, when you separate all those jarring sects, where are the millions of whom Mr. Pope speaks, with all the artifice of a practised rhetorician? But Mr. Pope would rather amuse us with powerful declamation, than descend to the vulgar level of argument. Is it honourable to adduce against me the Arian council of Basil? Is the Catholic church to be accountable for the conduct of those whom she had formally excommunicated? I have proved, that in the Catholic church exists the authority to put down error. Other churches tolerate a superficial conformity, and introduce into their bosoms vipers that will gnaw their very vitals. See how the Puritans overturned the established church, and kicked out the bishops of Scotland. It

is contrary to the spirit of the Protestant church to condemn error, and yet she retains the Athanasian creed, which proves that in her nature she is not tolerant. But she prudently exhibits this species of toleration, for otherwise her churches would be deserted, and the conventicles crowded to excess. If the king of England has no choice, but must remain a Protestant of the church of England, is not that a betrayal of conscience, and an inroad upon the exercise of private judgment? Is the Athanasian creed characteristic of that toleration of which the church of England boasts? The man who swears against the doctrines of the Catholic church perjures himself, as the council of Lateran declares. For it is not possible he can be certain that the oath he takes is true. How can any man swear, that the doctrines of the Catholic church are damnable and idolatrous? The oath is not that he *believes* them so, but that they are so for fact.

The declaration of his majesty, prefixed to the homilies, declares, that the thirty-nine articles of the church of England contain all things necessary; and it strictly prohibits all differences from them: "we will not allow (it says) the *least* deviation." The church of England, then, is not a particle more tolerant than the church of Rome, though it evinces a great variance in its practice. If the Protestant clergyman believes that a church has been established by Christ, he should uphold it—if he does not believe so, why should punishment be inflicted on those who separate from the communion of the church of England? Ought not the Protestant clergyman contend against those who rise in opposition to that church? If they be the successors of St. Peter, and if the Holy Ghost has endowed their church with the spirit of grace, as they would make us believe, she should exercise her authority, and not give the sanction of her name to every spawn of the innumerable sects that range themselves under the banner of Protestantism. Johanna Southcote exercised the right of private judgment when she announced herself as pregnant with the Messiah. Every man of sense must allow, that by private judgment we never can prove the inspiration of the scriptures. Why then will Mr. Pope not receive them upon the authority of the Catholic church, instead of resorting to the authority of frail and fallible man?

I asserted that Christ never gave a positive command to write the New Testament. If St. John, at Patmos, was ordered to write to particular churches, that does not by any means prove that a special command was given by our Saviour that the New Testament should be written, particularly as St. John wrote about facts, and not about doctrines to those particular churches.

The truth is, nearly sixty years had elapsed from the death of Christ till the last of the New Testament was written. Were the people of God left in the meantime without a rule of faith to guide and to direct them? Was it not the Roman Catholic church that converted these islands from paganism—missionaries sent from Rome to England rescued *that* land from idolatry and paganism. The Christian church was cemented in the first ages with the blood of martyrs—thirty-four Popes in succession after St. Peter became martyrs for the faith of Jesus Christ Forty-five others are canonized saints—Protestants also have their saints; and churches are dedicated to saints. I may here in passing, remark, that Catholics do not worship the saints—it is a rank calumny, invented in order to fling dust into the eyes of the multitude.

Mr. Pope has not yet attempted to answer my direct argument, both from scripture and the holy Fathers—he has indeed advanced, and the task was an easy one, several captious objections. If a Catholic happens not to know the history of every general council which has been held, the conclusion drawn from such premises by Mr. Pope is, that the church of Christ is proved not to be infallible. Has Mr. Pope quoted any texts of scripture, direct, plain, and obvious, like those I adduced? I have here more than seventy passages from the Fathers upon the subject, and I would read them to you if the time permitted. In one of them the church is compared to the ark of Noah, out of which no one shall be saved. I deny that we look upon all Protestants as heretics—we consider Arius, Luther, Calvin, &c. who have separated directly from the church, as heretics. But, as St. Augustin says, we do not consider the children or descendants of heretics, as formal heretics, unless they remain obstinate and contumacious in their errors. I am opposed to the doctrine of the Pope's infallibility. It is imposed upon me by Mr. Pope—but I have already stated that it forms no part of the doctrine of the Catholic church, and is not received by the Catholics throughout the world. I may conclude this day's discussion by again asserting that Christ promised he would be with his church teaching, preaching and baptizing until the consummation of the world—my scripture proofs therefore remain untouched.

Second Day.—Friday, April 20.

SUBJECT.—*The Divine Right of Private Judgment to pronounce upon the Authenticity, Integrity, and Canonicity of Scripture, and to determine its meaning in Articles of Faith.*

At eleven o'clock the Chair was taken by Daniel O'Connell, Esq. and Admiral Oliver.

Mr. Maguire rose, and called on Mr. Pope for proofs to sustain his rule of faith, which he (Mr. Maguire) understood to mean private judgment.

Mr. Pope—I shall preface my observations this day, by assuring the present meeting, that I was under the full conviction, that I should yesterday have had an opportunity of replying to Mr. Maguire's last speech. Mr. Maguire spoke six times, while my addresses were but five in number. In justice, therefore, the right of reply was vested in me: but as the chairmen were divided on the point, and as I felt that my arguments against the infallibility of the church of Rome had been cogent and satisfactory, I waved my privilege. I cannot avoid noticing the bold, and, I must say, unfounded assertion of my opponent that I did not touch one of his arguments. Gentlemen, you will decide on that question. I regret that it is the fashion of many advocates of the church of Rome, to substitute barefaced assertion and high-sounding language for solid argument.

With respect to the proofs of the right of private judgment, I shall first adduce negative evidence. If there be no infallible tribunal, man is under the necessity of exercising his judgment. I shall therefore make (partly in reply to Mr. Maguire) some remarks on the infallibility of the church of Rome. And first. I beg to say, that Mr. Maguire has not proved that the church of Rome is the church of Christ. The passages, I maintain, which he adduces from scripture, do not demonstrate the infallibility of *any* church—much less the infallibity of the *church of Rome.*

It is remarkable, that the church of Rome, which has defined every thing, has never given a definition of herself! In the conferences previous to the decrees of the eleventh session of the council of Trent, Vincent Lunello, a Franciscan friar, proposed that a definition of the church and her authority should precede the declarations of the disputed points of doctrine. The motion was rejected.—(Sarpi's History of the Council of Trent, l. iv, p. 155, Geneva, 1625.) If the church has not

defined herself, how are her votaries to discover the source from which they are to derive their opinions. Mr. Maguire also admitted, if I mistake not, that in the primitive ages the church of Rome was not looked upon as the Catholic church.

In reference to Matt. v, 13.—"But if the salt has lost its savor," &c. I beg to observe, that Maundrell in his travels, expressly mentions, that

"In the Valley of Salt, near Gebul, and about four hours' journey from Aleppo, there is a small precipice, occasioned by the continual taking away of the salt. In this, says he, you may see how the veins of it lie: I broke a piece of it, of which the part exposed to the rain, sun, and air, though it had *the sparks* and *particles* of salt, yet had *perfectly lost its savor*, as in Matt. v."

Again—there was an asphaltic substance, which was used by the Jews to salt their sacrifices, and which, if kept too long, lost its flavour, and was thrown upon the floor of the Temple to prevent the Priests' slipping. Hence the allusion—"*Trodden under foot of men.*" These observations will, I trust, serve to show that the Saviour *in the passage which we are considering*, could not have alluded to the infallibility of the Apostles.

Does my friend mean to say, that the Sixtine and Clementine editions do not vary in *minima particula?* I have a work now before me, "Horne's Introduction to the Study of the Scriptures," in which he gives us a specimen of the discrepancies existing between the Clementine and Sixtine editions. As to Jacob worshipping the top of his rod, as the Douay Testament has it, I beg to observe, that the Apostle Paul quoted from the Septuagint. The original Hebrew word in the 47th of Genesis and 31st verse, to which St. Paul refers, according to the different pointing, signifies both "a rod and a bed." The Douay Bible translates the passage (Gen. xlvii, 31,) thus: "And he said, swear thou to me. And as he was swearing, Israel *adored God*, TURNING TO the bed's head." The scholars, however, can at once decide, whether "Jacob adored the top of his rod" is not a gross mistranslation of the original text.

Mr. Maguire insinuated that the canons of the third council of Lateran, (27 and 16,) relative to the persecution of heretics, and to oaths which militate against ecclesiastical utility, are matters of discipline; but I insist that they relate to morals—"*pertinent ad mores.*" We all know, how Jesuits and others interpret "Ecclesiastical utility."

It is a remarkable fact, that the pope may be the sole author of the canons of a council. Dupin, in reference to the 70 canons passed in the fourth or great Lateran council, (vol. ii p. 449,) writes,

"Matthew Paris says, that these canons seemed tolerable to some of the prelates, but grievous to others. His words are these, '*Facto prius ab ipso*

ipa exhortationis sermone, recitata sunt in pleno concilio capitula septuaginta, quæ aliis placabilia, aliis videbantur onerosa." Let the case be how it will, it is certain, that these canons were not made by the council but by Innocent III, who presented them to the council ready drawn up, and ordered them to be read; and that the prelates did not enter into any debate upon them, so that their silence was taken for an approbation."

Is it not evident, therefore, that the canons were forced upon the council by Pope Innocent III?

The Rev. Dr. Murray, in his examination before the Commission's committee, p. 223, when asked,

"Will you be so good as to explain the nature of the authority of the Pope?" replied, "he is the executive power of the church; his office is to enforce the observance of the canons."

I would remark, that the Pope possesses also a dispensing power.—The Maynooth class-book informs us,

"That the Pope may, according to circumstances, dispense even with the laws of a general council, whenever a legitimate cause shall arise."—P. 360.

Mr. Butler states,

"That, in the opinion of all Roman Catholics, it belongs to the Pope in extraordinary cases to act in opposition to the canons."

Do not these statements sufficiently demonstrate the supreme power exercised by the Pope, both in council and out of council?

Mr. Maguire was offended by my reference to the council of Basil. I ask, was the council of Basil ever regarded as a general council? Bellarmine (de Eccles. Milit. c. 16.) remarks,

"That the council of Basil was at first a true ecumenical council and infallible, but afterwards became a schismatical conventicle, and of no authority at all!"

Again, Bellarmine says, (De Roman. Pont. l. ii, c. 11.)

"The council of Basil, by common consent, and with the legate's concurrence, concluded that a council is above the Pope, which is now rightly judged erroneous."

It is a fact, that there is no standard of the Roman Catholic faith in general use in this country. Dr. Doyle, speaking on this subject, says,

"Besides the articles enumerated in the creed of Pius the fourth, there are others to be received as of faith. These are defined in the sacred canons, of which some are received entire, some in part, and of which no account can be obtained from the formularies to which the Roman Catholic bishops have referred to as authentic."—*Dr. Doyle's Evidence before the House of Lords, p.* 180.

So much for Dr. Doyle's opinion upon the subject.

As we have seen that great uncertainty exists with respect to general councils, I ask again, (as Mr. Maguire has not solved the question) whether the character of the council is to decide the orthodoxy of the doctrine, or the orthodoxy of the doctrine to decide the character of the council? If the former, who is to

decide upon the characteristics of a general council? If th orthodoxy of the doctrine is to decide the character of th council, why is not the council of Tyre, held A. D. 535 received as general, as well as the first of Nice, both having been alike called by imperial authority? Mr. Maguire has told us, that a council approved by the Pope is infallible. Then the decrees were fallible before the Pope confirmed them. For instance, the decrees of the council of Trent were fallible, until they received the sanction of the representatives of the Pope at the council? It is admitted, that a council without the Pope is fallible, and that the Pope *per se* is also fallible. Again Mr. Maguire remarks, that the decrees of the Pope, assisted by a few bishops are infallible, when "received by the universal church." I am desirous of knowing what is the meaning of "the universal church." I presume that it signifies the Roman Catholic hierarchies in Ireland, in Spain, and elsewhere. These bodies are confessedly fallible. I wish then to know by what process decrees set forth by *fallible* authority become *infallible* when received by *fallible* bodies of men. Again, Bellarmine speaks of general councils, which are to be altogether rejected and of general councils partly to be received and partly to be rejected; and also remarks that several things in councils allowed to be general, were foisted in by heretics. We must therefore have another infallible tribunal to decide, what councils are really general, and what passages in them are the interpolations of heretics! Some councils, according to Delahogue, are but partially received in some countries, and wholly admitted in others. For instance, that of Constance. Some doubt of the ecumenicity of the first council of Lyons. (Delahogue, p. 448.) The fifth Lateran council has been doubted of, according to Bellarmine, *non quasdam sessiones*, not as to some sessions, but in toto, altogether.

Further—If I admit the church of Rome to be infallible, then I must acknowledge its decisions as divine. But two divine traditions, which must necessarily come from the same source, cannot possibly contradict each other: yet the second council of Lateran (Can. 6.) prohibits the marriage of ecclesiastics, on the ground of immutable and inherent holiness. The canon remarks—

"When they ought both to be, and to be called the temple of God, the vessels of the Lord, the shrine of the Holy Ghost, it is unworthy that they should become the slaves of chambering and uncleanness."

Such is the language in which the council speaks of marriage. But what says the scriptures?

"Marriage is *honourable* IN ALL, and the bed undefiled, but whoremongers and adulterers God will judge." Heb. xiii. 4.

On this subject the Bible is directly at issue with the church of Rome, therefore she cannot be infallible.—Again, permit me to ask, were I to grant for the moment, that the church of Rome is infallible—is there not much danger, les mistakes should occur in the interpretation of the meaning of her councils?

We have argued on the claims of the church of Rome to infallibility. I have appealed to scripture, reason, common sense, and facts. How shall we decide, whether Mr. Maguire's opinion on the subject, or mine, be correct? If I find a church contradicting itself, I have *prima-facie* evidence that she is fallible.—The council of Constance deposed three Popes, who attempted to sit together in the chair of St. Peter (which was well nigh broken, as Fuller says,) and appointed another Pope. On the other hand, the council of Florence and Trent have raised the authority of the Pope above a council. Here is a palpable contradiction on the authority of the Pope.—Again, the council of Ephesus decreed—

"That it should not be lawful to utter, write, or compose any other faith than that which had been defined by the Nicene Fathers; and that, *if any darec to offer any other creed, if ecclesiastics, they should be removed from their office alienos esse; if laics, that they should be anathematized.*"—(Labb. et Coss. Conc. tom. iii, p. 668.)

Here you observe that the council of Ephesus deposed ecclesiastics and anathematized laics who should compose any other faith than that which has been defined by the Nicene Fathers. Compare the Nicene Creed with that of Pope Pius, and you will find the latter differing from the former in many particulars, and containing many articles not to be found in the Nicene Creed. I, therefore, without hesitation conclude, that we have "the church" of one age contradicting "the church" of another age. Again—the second Nicene council declares that one reason for worshipping the image of Christ is, that he is not *sensibly* present with us, but *only* in his Divinity;—Act iv, p. 305. And the epistle of Germanus, received by the council, says, *that he is not present "σωματικως" bodily. It also anathematizes all who assert that Christ was not circumscribed as to his humanity.* I ask, are not these opinions plainly opposed to the doctrine of transubstantiation? But the church of Rome now receives the doctrine of transubstantiation. Again, therefore, we have "the church" of one age against "the church" of another age. Let these contradictions go before the world, and that world will come to the conclusion that the church of Rome is not infallible. Believe me, it is this claim to infallibility, which will give the death-blow to the church of Rome. She dares not alter a single tenet; her doctrines are written as with a diamond—they are engraven on tables of brass, and she cannot reform

I therefore repeat that her vain assumption of infallibility will, in the dispensations of Providence, give her the death-blow by which she shall fall. If then, there be no infallible tribunal in existence, must we not be under the necessity of exercising our private judgments.

When we talk of the right of private judgment, it should be understood that we mean not that every man is justified in putting any explanation that fancy may suggest on the word of God. —We must exercise our judgments as accountable beings, according to the rules of common sense, and the analogy of scripture, with due submission to the moral restraints arising from the opinions of men of sound understanding *and piety*.—Do we say that a man who exercises his judgment on the contents of any work which he may peruse, is justified in adopting the idle imaginations of his own brain as the meaning of the author? No—we instantly reject such an absurd opinion. But in reading the scriptures we are not only to exercise our judgment with the same care which we would bestow upon other volumes, but *as beings accountable to God, and as deeply interested in the concerns of an eternal world.* These are considerations by which a man is solemnly called upon to exercise his judgment upon the subject-matter of the inspired records—these are rules by which, I conceive, he is to be guided in that exercise. The misinterpretation of the law of the land is no justification for the commission of illegal acts; nor will the misunderstanding of God's blessed word, on the great fundamental truths of the Christian system, afford any security to error, but will expose us to the wrath of the great Eternal. I now come to my direct proofs of the right of private judgment. Truly it is an extraordinary question; Am I justified in employing my intellectual faculties? Why are faculties bestowed on men, if they are not to be exercised? If I am not to exercise them, is not my accountability destroyed? The church of Rome must allow her own votaries to exercise their private judgment on the *proofs* of her authority. They must lay the foundation of their system on private judgment; and if they can lay the foundation, why should they not be competent to raise the superstructure? If they must examine the basis, why should they not be allowed to exercise their faculties upon the nature of the edifice which rests upon it? Religion is a personal matter. It is written in the word of God:

"Every man shall bear *his own* burden."—Gal. vi, 6.

"Every one of us shall render an account to God *for himself*."—Rom. civ, 12.

The idea of an infallible tribunal requires me to give up the exercise of my faculties, in opposition to the natural constitution

of the human mind. I cannot believe any thing, except on evidence. Who formed the mind? The Deity. If the exercise of my judgment, therefore, coincides with the natural constitution of the mind, then to exercise that judgment must be my noble prerogative—must be my bounden duty. Gentlemen, put together these observations, and you cannot avoid coming to the plain and evident conclusion, that there is no infallible tribunal Are we not, therefore, thrown back upon our own judgments. Weigh the considerations in subservience to which the judgment should be exercised—the moral accountability of man, the voice of common sense and reason—and will you not join issue with me, and assert, that the exercise of private judgment is the birthright of every son and daughter of Adam?

[*Mr. O'Connell being obliged to retire upon professional business, the Chair was taken in his stead by Mr. Hugh O'Connor.*]

Mr. MAGUIRE.—Mr. Pope has commenced by making a very long complaint that he had it not in his power to reply to me yesterday evening. It was decided by the chair that he had no right to reply; and if the time specified in the regulations was expired, why should he make the demand? By what magic could he transfer that right to himself, when chance gave me the opportunity of speaking last? With regard to what has been advanced by Mr. Pope from Fra Paolo, respecting the council of Trent, I at once deny the authority of such a man. Mr. Pope introduced yesterday much irrelevant matter, which had nothing to do with the question of the infallibility of the church of Rome; and this day he has advanced but one or two reasons for the faith which he himself professes. He says, that I have not proved my church to be the church of Christ; I already said, that the question, then before us was, not whether the Catholic church was the church of Christ, but whether Christ had established a church on earth, and endowed it with the prerogative of infallibility? The Protestant churches, divided as they are upon the *most essential points*, can lay no claim to infallibility. But one church claims to be infallible, and but one church possesses any pretensions to the title. No other church has even the semblance or outward appearance of infallibility. To prove that Christ established an infallible church, I quoted various texts of scripture. Mr. Pope seemed either to be afraid or ashamed to recur to scripture on the subject of private judgment. I showed yesterday that what was meant by the church of Christ, was all the churches in the world holding communion with the See of Rome, which was deemed the mother and matrice of all Christian churches, as St. Cyprian calls it. All the churches in that communion form the generic

term of the church of Christ. Mr. Pope again endeavoured to draw a distinction between the Catholic church and the church of Rome. I have already shown the term Roman was applied to the Catholic church in order to distinguish her from the churches which the heretics set up in opposition. The Deists, no doubt, will feel obliged to Mr. Pope for the argument he has advanced relative to the salt. This argument was most vauntingly put forward by Voltaire against the *Divinity of Christ*, and the infallibility of his Apostles. That celebrated infidel, with blasphemous flippancy, declared, that Christ was a great blockhead to compare his Apostles to the salt of the earth, as an argument of their infallibility, and undertook to prove that the salt *can lose* its essence, and consequently *that Christ was ignorant of chemistry*, and his Apostles, by their Master's own comparison, proved to be fallible. But his shallow and ridiculous arguments were triumphantly refuted by Christian divines. Now, if Mr. Pope can demonstrate that salt may lose its savor, he will establish a position equally fatal to the infallibility of the Apostles, and to *the divinity of Christ himself*. Thus will he effectuate a cordial union between the representatives of Voltaire and the followers of the Rev. Mr. Pope. Catholics, however, despise the argument of the refined blasphemer, to prove that salt may be decomposed, and abhor the system to which its origin is traced.—The Catholic has no need to examine the definitions of general councils—there are few indeed who could accomplish that task, If he be once satisfied that the church of Christ *cannot lead him into error*, he, like St. Augustin rests with security his faith upon her authority. She proposes the dogmas—he readily gives his assent. Now, in order to convince himself of the infallibility of his church, he has only to refer to the scripture. He finds multiplied in the sacred volume evident promises, which, if they prove not infallibility, are words without meaning or substance. Christ says to his Apostle.

"Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it."—Matt. xvi, 18.

"The church is the pillar and the ground of truth."—1 Tim. iii, 15.

"He that does not hear the church, let him be to thee as the Heathen and the Publican."—Matt. xviii, 18.

"I will send you the Spirit of Truth, to teach you all truth."—John xvi, 13.

"I will send you another Paraclete, to abide with you for ever."—John xiv, 16.

"I shall be with you all days, even to the end of the world."—Matt. xxviii, 20.

If the Roman Catholic be not convinced from those texts that Christ has established an unerring church to guide the ignorant, and to whom her children are bound to yield obedience, I desire to know *how can private judgment enable* him to *decide* upon *the*

texts of scripture, not half so strong, and assuredly *not half so obvious.*

Mr. Pope says, that all Roman Catholics must examine the various councils of his church before he can prudently make an act of faith. The reverse, however, is true. Mr. Pope might just as well assert, that the lower order of Protestants should not doubt of Catholic faith, unless they were able to prove from the acts of council that the Catholic church is not infallible; and his, I imagine, he will scarcely admit. The faith of Roman Catholics rest upon the *promises of Jesus Christ to his church*, which promises they conceive are sufficiently explicit to satisfy the most sceptic mind. It is easier for a Catholic to ascertain this simple truth, viz:—*Did Christ promise* that his *church should not fail?*—than for a Protestant to inquire and scrupulously examine into *every doubt*, and *difficulty*, and *argument.* The private judgment of the ignorant Catholic leads him to yield his assent to the authority of that church which has formed the largest society of Christians since the coming of the Messiah. And when he adds to the authority of this church, the corresponding authority of the Greek church, which differs from his own in no article of faith, save the procession of the Holy Ghost, he feels his motives of credibility confirmed, and recognizes a safeguard for his own *conscious ignorance.* On the contrary, how can illiterate Protestants, thousands of whom *cannot even read*, ascertain whether the New Testament be an inspired work? whether such a text were spoken by Christ himself, or by an inspired disciple? Is every ignorant peasant able to know that any particular book of scripture is inspired by the Holy Ghost? Can the lower order of Protestants, (*and it was for the poor especially that Christ instituted his church*)—can the ignorant and illiterate amongst the Protestants, who cannot have recourse to the authority of that church to which Christ gave the deposit of faith—that church which, in what is called the dark ages, *when a single Protestant was not to be heard of*, preserved the copies of the Bible, and that noble translation which St. Jerome accomplished, fourteen centuries before the Reformation—I ask, will the humble Protestant, when deprived of such assistance, be able to prove the word of God? If not, and it is plain he cannot, then 'vana est prædicatio vestra, vana fides ejus'—'vain is your preaching, and vain his faith.' As soon as the Roman Catholic ascertains the true marks of Christ's church, and finds those marks to belong exclusively to the Catholic church, he is at once satisfied—he believes it is inspired by the Holy Ghost, and he rests firm in his faith. The Catholic church has remained for 1800 years—it has defied all the efforts of persecution—it has survived the wreck and shocks of time, and will defy, till the end of the world,

all the heretics who may rise in opposition to it. This proves that is upheld by the finger of God alone.

Mr. Pope has said, that Innocent the Third forced the canons upon the third Lateran council. He brought them ready framed to the council, and because, *after they were debated*, they were approved of by the council, therefore he is to be considered as having forced them on the council. According to this rule, any one who should originate or introduce a measure in the House of Commons that might afterwards happen to be passed into a law, should be considered as having forced it on the house, though the measure had been regularly debated and approved of. It might as well be said that the regulations for this meeting, which had been framed by Messrs. Lawless and Singer, and which were subsequently approved of by us, had been forced upon us by them.

Mr. Pope's assertion, that the Pope is able to dispense with the decrees of councils, is an unworthy quibble. He quotes Delahogue to prove that the Pope has the power of dispensing with the canons of councils, but these are canons which relate to mere discipline. The council of Trent, for example, decreed that no persons should marry within four degrees of kindred; yet every bishop can dispense in that degree of consanguinity. I have already explained to you, that the decrees of councils in matters of discipline are not unalterable; but they are immutable in matters which regard the deposit of faith. It would be foolish and ridiculous to contend that the head of the church should not have it in his power to dispense with the rules and regulations of discipline which may be enacted from time to time, and prove expedient or otherwise according to circumstances. The Pope is able to dispense with the ecclesiastical law; but neither the Pope nor a general council can change an article of faith. I here challenge Mr. Pope to show me where any one of the eighteen ecumenical councils differs from the remainder in a single particle connected with faith; I have already defied him to do so, and he has not been able to discover a scintilla of difference between them in matters of faith. He has had recourse to the council of Basil; that council was, at first, regularly convened by the Pope, but when it had assembled to determine upon doctrine, the emperor introduced into it a phalanx of Arian bishops. The orthodox bishops refused to sit with them, and adjourned to another place. The Arian bishops proceeded to hold their cabal, and issued their decrees, and fulminated censures against the orthodox bishops. The council was ecumenical in the commencement of its sitting, but it was forced to adjourn on account of the rabble of Arians introduced by the emperor.

Mr. Pope asserts, that Dr. Doyle deems the notes appended to the Bible of no effect. Mr. Pope is under a palpable mistake with regard to the commentaries affixed to the Bible. No Catholic is called upon to agree with those notes, only as far as his private judgment may lead him to do so. We are not inimical to the exercise of private judgment, where matters of faith are not concerned or endangered. We are allowed to exercise our private judgment in other matters. Does it follow, because we acknowledge an infallible authority to decide upon *matters of doctrine*, that that authority should bind us down in other matters, and decree, for example, at what particular time or place we should breakfast or dine? The notes appended to the Bible are merely intended to explain to the ignorant, matters relating to faith and morality, which, of themselves, they are unable to explain. They are intended to *guide*, not to *lead* the judgment, and to assist the ignorant and unlettered. There are copious notes and commentaries to the Protestant Bible. If private judgment be their *sole rule of faith*, why are Protestants obliged to have notes and comments? If they be found useful to the Protestant, why should they not be equally useful to the Catholic, who admits an infallible authority in matters of faith, but who can exercise his private judgment in matters unconnected with faith? Mr. Pope has again told you that we have no authorized version of the scriptures. I have already shown you that we have such a version. I defy him to prove the '*Vulgate*' corrupt. He has not, he could not; yet he repeats the assertion And if Mr. Pope's edition of the Bible be deemed a regular and genuine one, I contend that ours is ten times more so. I insist, that of all editions of the Bible, ours is the best. There may be found some verbal inaccuracies—in that respect I do not say it is immaculate. We have the Latin Vulgate, the genuine translation of the Bible, made by St. Jerome, 1400 years before Luther or Calvin were heard of. Mr. Pope inquires how we can ascertain when a general council is regularly convened. It is as easy to ascertain that matter, as it is when our British Parliament is regularly convened. When the head of the Catholic church regularly convenes a sufficient number of bishops, that assemblage morally represents the church, and its decrees are admitted by Roman Catholics as decrees of a general council. When the council met at Jerusalem to decide upon circumcision, they gave us an examplar of a council—"it appeared good to the Holy Ghost and to us." I never asserted, that if the Pope approves of the decrees of a council, they are therefore infallible. That is contrary to Catholic doctrine. What I asserted was, that if the decrees of a council, though not a general one, be admitted by the church dispersed, they

they are infallible. When a general council was regularly convened by the Pope, and when no violence was attempted to influence or overawe it by Arian emperors, then we look upon it as the collective body of the church, which decides according to the inspiration of the Holy Ghost. Mr. Pope asks what is he Catholic church? It is formed of all the Christian churches throughout the world, in communion with the See of Rome, which is the matrice of Christianity, as St. Cyprian called it. St. Jerome, writing to Pope Damasus, says—

"From a pastor I beg the defence of a sheep. I speak to the fisherman's successor, and to the disciple of the cross—acknowledging none but Christ to be chief. I am joined in communion with your holiness—that is with the chair of Peter: upon this rock I know the church was built. To thee I know were given the keys of the kingdom of heaven. Whoever gathereth not with thee scattereth," &c.

Mr. Pope has recurred to the council of Constance, which deposed three Popes. Now, the facts of the case are the strongest proof that Christ watches over his church. One Pope having been regularly elected, another was thrust into his place through the cabal of secular power, and the real Pope driven into banishment where he died. The surviving Pope was then approved of, lest a schism should be created in the church. The contest continued for forty years. The Pope regularly elected by the cardinals was looked upon as the real and true Pope. The other two Popes were called upon to resign by the council, and submitted to the sentence rather than distract the peace of the church. Could there be a clearer proof that Christ has always continued to watch over his church.

Mr. Pope rose and said—I really regret to be obliged to say, that there has been either misconception or misrepresentation on the part of my learned friend. What I have advanced as to the uncertainty of Councils, has not been built on Father Paul's History of the Council of Trent, but on the testimony of Delahogue, in his "Tractatus de Ecclesia," (which is the manual of the college of Maynooth,) and upon the authority of cardinal Bellarmine. Mr. Maguire says, that I have brought forward no contradictions. Is this the case? When we find one council deposing three Popes as anti-popes, and setting up another in their place, and the power of a council over the Pope, practically recognized in the approval of the measure by the general church of Rome; and when the councils of Trent and Florence, on the other hand, decree that the Pope is above a council—is there not council against council? Again—all who acced to the Nicene creed, were condemned by the council of Ephesus; while the creed of Pope Pius. which contains many articles of

faith, not to be found in the Nicene creed, is received by the church of Rome. Here then is "the church" of one age against "the church" of another. The second Nicene council assigned as a reason for the worship of images, that Christ is not *sensibly* present on earth, but *only* in his divinity; and the epistle of Germanus, received by that council, asserts, that Christ is not present with us "*bodily*." It also anathematized all who declare, that Christ was not circumscribed as to his humanity. Are not these declarations opposed to the doctrine of transubstantiation; and do they not prove that "the church" of one age has contradicted "the church" of another?

My opponent has said, that I am afraid to meet him on the grounds of scripture. I should rejoice, if we confined ourselves to the law and to the testimony. In appealing to Fathers, councils, and ecclesiastical writers, I am departing from my own ground. If I weigh the church of Rome in "Divine Balance," as St. Augustin calls the sacred scriptures, (De Bapt. cont. Donat. l. ii. c. 6,) the scale in which the church of Rome might happen to be placed, would soon be raised aloft. With respect to Judas, I stated that he was one to whom the Lord addressed the words, "Ye are the salt of the earth," in evidence that he did not *thereby* intend to describe the infallibility of the Apostles. Far be it from me to deny, that *the Apostles* were infallible. As to the expression "the pillar and ground of truth," I would ask, when Basil, (in his 70th epistle) speaking of the persecution of the churches in Cappadocia calls them "pillars and ground of truth," did he mean to say that each church was infallible? As to my friend's justification of the conduct of Pope Innocent at the Lateran council, he should remember, that although ministers often bring bills into Parliament, yet are the bills discussed before they are passed into a law; and it is well known, that ministers do not always succeed in their measures. The canons of the Roman Catholic church refer to matters of faith as well as discipline. In the Class-book of Maynooth, and in Butler no exception is made with respect to the dispensing power of the Pope not relating to canons containing articles of faith.

One circumstance in addition to those which I have already advanced, shall now be considered, in order to show that the church of Rome is not infallible. Where the spirit of truth is, there shall we find the fruits of righteousness. Hermanus Von der Hardt informs us, that others besides *divines* and grave secular men attended Constance during the council—to wit—barbers, three hundred and six, players, jesters, three hundred and forty-six, pastry-cooks, three hundred and twenty-five, and harlots, seven hundred!! (Vid. Herm. Von Der Hardt de Rebus Universalis Concilii Constantinensis, Tom. v, et Gerardi Dacheri

Constantinensis Historiam Magnatum in Constan. Conc. ex MSS. Vindobonensi Cæsareo.) The character of the council of Trent is drawn by one of its members, Duditheus, bishop of five churches, who writing to the emperor Maximillian II gives this account:

"We daily saw hungry and needy bishops come to Trent; youths for the most part which did begin to have beards, (grave and sage divines!) given over to luxury and riot, HIRED ONLY TO GIVE THEIR VOICES AS THE POPE PLEASED. They were unlearned and simple *yet fit for their purpose in regard of their impudent boldness.*

In one of the early sessions of the council, when there were present only forty-eight bishops; they decreed the authority of the Vulgate, of tradition, and of the Apocrypha.—Father Paul, who was never excommunicated that I am aware of, says:

"Some thought it strange that five cardinals and forty-eight bishops should have so easily defined the most important and principal points of religion, which till then, had never been decided; giving canonical authority to books considered uncertain and apocryphal; rendering authentic a translation, *differing from the original text*, and instructing and prescribing the manner of understanding the word of God. *Nor was there amongst the prelates any one worthy of attention from his learning.* There were some lawyers, learned, perhaps, in that profession, but unskilled in religion—a few theologians, but these of less than ordinary talent, the greater number gentlemen, or *courtiers;* and as to their dignities, some were only titular—the greater part, bishops of so small a place, that considering each to represent his own people, *it could not be said that one thousandth part of the Christian world were represented.*

Is it not an insult to common sense to suppose, that you could for a moment regard assemblies, composed of such characters capable of deciding infallibly upon articles of faith, and of enlightening the world upon the great truths of salvation? No —never can I entertain such an extravagant, such a monstrous absurdity. The light of the nineteenth century, believe me, will pour its mighty rays upon the church of Rome, and expose it in all its naked deformity to the world.

My friend has told us, that *we may exercise our private judgment upon the notes of the Bible, provided they refer not to matters of faith.* It is not always easy to distinguish between matters of faith and other articles. But what shall we say as to morals? At a full meeting of the Roman Catholic board, held in December, 1816, the notes of an edition of the Douay Bible, which had just appeared, were pronounced by a gentleman who has just left the chair, as containing damnable doctrines. The same individual declared, that he would not continue within the pale of the church of Rome, if those notes were not publicly disavowed The Roman Catholic hierarchy have not however protested against them. I would ask in this place, does not the opinion, that notes are indispensably necessary for the right understanding of the sacred volume, imply, that *the word of man* is more intel

ligible than *the word of the living God?* Mr. Maguire observed that Protestants also have notes appended to their Bibles. Surely a Protestant does not act inconsistently with his principles when he consults a commentator. I may avail myself of the light which a fellow-man throws upon a passage of scripture, without deeming him infallible. My friend has again asserted, that his translation is the genuine version. Is his version genuine, when it contradicts the original? I submit to the learned world, to decide, whether the Douay version be more correct than the Protestant Bible. I have already referred to the passage relative to Jacob worshipping his staff. Is "penance" a correct rendering of the word "μετανοια," which obviously signifies a change of mind? I shall be told, perhaps, that the Vulgate renders "μετανοεῖν" "agere penitentiam." But who is so ignorant of Latin, as not to know, that "agere otium" signifies "to be at leisure;" "Agere vitam," "to live?" and so I would translate "Agere penitentiam," "to repent."

It is worthy of remark, that Delahogue does not number among the eighteen general councils, *the council* of Jerusalem, as the Roman Catholic divines designate the assembly at Jerusalem. Let my friend adduce the same proofs of the inspiration of councils, as those which the Apostles exhibited, and then shall we bow down to their authority. I am asked how the poor man is to decide whether the Bible be the word of God? I would premise, that *the right to do a thing and the power to do it, are very different.* I may have a right to go to the East Indies, and yet be unable to undertake so long a voyage. Therefore I again repeat, that THE RIGHT TO DO A THING, AND THE POWER TO DO IT, ARE VERY DIFFERENT. I am asked, how the poor man is to decide whether the Bible be the word of God? As to the poor Protestant or Roman Catholic, when I present them with a copy of the Scriptures, they will probably be found to be already in possession of some general notion of its inspiration. I shall take a still more extreme case: I shall consider the situation of a person in a distant country, who has been previously altogether ignorant of the existence of the word of life—illiterate, but capable of reading. I present him with the sacred scriptures, and remark, that a perusal of their contents will convince him that the volume has proceeded from God. The man feels himself to be a sinner, and a depraved creature; he witnesses daily proofs of human mortality, but unacquainted with the scenes which lie beyond the grave, peoples them with the visions of his own distempered imagination. The inspired records meet the circumstances in which he is placed, by making known peace and pardon through a Saviour's blood, and by throwing of light over his pre-

sent and everlasting destinies. Surely if we can discover the existence of God from the works of his hands, we may doubtless expect, if the Bible have come from Him, that it contains such proofs of its divine origin, that the sinner shall be constrained to acknowledge "God has spoken of a truth," and to say of the Bible, as the woman of Samaria said of the Redeemer, "Come, see a man that told me all that ever I did; is not this the Christ?" The inspired volume penetrates the inmost recesses of the heart, lays open the secrets of the soul, discovers a man to himself, and carries its own witness that it has emanated from the Fountain of Light. I would also remark, that the written word is not the only means which God has provided for the instruction of man. He has also appointed the preaching of his Gospel. The individual who has received the knowledge of salvation through the medium of oral instruction, finds no difficulty in receiving the sacred oracles as an inspired volume. He approaches them with a spiritual appetite, and experiences the word of truth to be the life and comfort of his soul. "As well," will he exclaim, "as well might you endeavour to persuade me, that there is no light nor warmth in the sun, as to tell me, that no spiritual consolation flows from the doctrines contained in this blessed volume."

This is an extreme case—I have met it; but permit me to say, that there are innumerable proofs of the authenticity, integrity, and canonicity of the inspired volume—and I am ready, when called upon to state them. I now ask Mr. Maguire, by what mode he would prove to an individual in circumstances similar to those which we have been considering, that the Bible is a divine revelation? Mark this question Mr. Maguire, and let me have an answer.

Is it, let me ask, the case, that infidels and atheists are chiefly found among the Protestant poor? Need I reply in the negative? Who have been the authors of heresies? Dupin informs us—

"If there be obscure and difficult parts in the Bible, it is not generally the simple who abuse them, but the proud and learned who make a bad use of them. For in fine it is not the ignorant and the simple who have formed heresies in perverting the word of God.—*They who do so, are generally bishops, priests, learned and enlightened persons.* So that so far from knowing by experience, that the reading of the scriptures is dangerous to the simple and the ignorant, one may say, that we learn therefrom that it seldom causes any but the learned to fall into error, and *that the simple have generally found there nothing but what is edifying and instructive.*" —Dissert. prelim. sur la Bible. B. i, c. 9. Par. 1701.

Cardinal Bellarmine writes as follows:

"Heresies originate with men of the upper rank rather than with persons belonging to the inferior classes. *Beyond a doubt almost all authors of heresies have been either bishops or presbyters* (or as some would perhaps translate it, priests.) Heresies are therefore to be considered as the factions of leading

men, without whom there would be no *popular* revolts in the church."—De Romano Pont. l. i, c. 8, ultima editio ab ipso Authore Recognita. Coloniæ fol. 1620, tom. i, p. 527.

THE PEOPLE, I maintain, ARE THE SAFEST DEPOSITARIES OF GOD'S BLESSED WORD. Ecclesiastics may be tempted to pervert it; the poor are not likely to suffer such a temptation. If therefore, the liability of the sacred scriptures to perversion, furnish a just reason for withdrawing the inspired volume from any portion of the community, it should be taken from ecclesiastics who have abused it, and put into the hands of the poor and the unlettered.

The church of Rome, where she is dominant, may succeed by the strong hand of ecclesiastical despotism in repressing the outward expression of opinion. Have you never heard of Jews abroad, in order to avoid persecution, entering the priesthood, and while celebrating mass, cursing the power which obliges them to act in opposition to their conscience? The Rev. Joseph Blanco White, who was chaplain to the king of Spain, now a clergyman of the church of England, and who lived in the communion of the church of Rome, twenty-five years in sincere submission, and ten in secret rebellion against her authority, in his "Evidence against Catholicism," 2d edit. p. 7, writes thus—

"At the end of a year from the preaching of this sermon—the confession is painful, indeed, yet due to religion itself—*I was bordering upon atheism.* If my case were singular, if my knowledge of the most enlightened classes of Spain did not furnish me with a multitude of sudden transitions from sincere faith and piety to the most outrageous infidelity: I would submit to the humbling conviction, that either weakness of judgment, or fickleness of character had been the only source of my errors. But though I am not at liberty to mention individual cases, I do attest, from the most certain knowledge, that *the history of my own mind is, with little variation, that of a great portion of the Spanish* CLERGY. *The fact is certain;* I make no individual charge; every one who comes within this general description may still wear the mask, which no Spaniard can throw off, without bidding an eternal farewell to his country."

The church of Rome may look in some measure fair and united; but within, the system is full of dead men's bones and all uncleanness.

I now call upon Mr. Maguire to inform us, by what mode the poor man can know according to his views, that the Bible is the book of God.

Mr. MAGUIRE.—I wish Mr. Pope would afford me something tangible to comment upon. I fling back his Protestant and Huguenot authorities. I was not a little astonished to hear Mr. Pope quote that apostate, Blanco White, as an authority against the Catholic church. I assert that the man who lived for ten years, according to his own testimony, an *atheist* a

heart, is no worthy of credence, when testifying against the Roman Catholic church. Mr. Pope has again quoted from Dr. Delahogue; but when he proves that Dr. Delahogue has written any thing contrary to Catholic faith, he will certainly have achieved much. Mr. Pope has endeavoured to make a point about the word *μετανοια*. It is the Greek word for doing penance, and it is used in the passage quoted from the sacred volume, in reference to the men of Nineveh, of whom Christ says "the men of Nineveh shall rise in judgment with this generation, and shall condemn it; because they did penance at the preaching of Jonas:" the Protestant translation has it "because they repented." Our Saviour in that passage alluded to the repentance of the men of Nineveh—what was that repentance? They did penance in sackcloth and ashes; they fasted for three days; and they did not even suffer their cattle to eat any thing during that period. and we find it recorded in the sacred volume, that their repentance, or penance, disarmed the wrath of God. Fasting and praying are thrown overboard now-a-days, when we have the liberty of the gospel. Pampering the body is now the plan. and good works are scouted as being things of supererogation. It is only in the Catholic church we find fasting and praying practised.

Mr. Pope says, that a number of harlots came to the council of Trent, and he quotes Fra Paolo, an historian than whose authority he could not produce worse. I could relate disgraceful facts of another church, matters which rest not upon the ipse dixit of a partial historian, but which are well known to have occured. I shall not, however, insult this meeting, nor pullute my lips with the recital of such filthy impurities. It was, to say the least of it, a breach of good manners on the part of Mr. Pope towards the ladies who are present, to introduce the scandalous frabrication of that faithless historian. I will not disgrace my situation here and in the church, by descending to such arguments. I could, if I pleased, quote much to you about Henry the Eighth, and the Virgin Elizabeth. I could tell you matters of fact with regard to those patrons of the reformation—and, indeed, I might, by the relation of a few facts, take ample revenge upon my antagonist.

Mr. Pope talks of there having been hungry bishops at the council of Trent—that is a charge that cannot be made against the Protestant bishops of the present day, who have got the tithes and the green acres. I would warn the Protestant bishops and clergy, who are in possession of the *good things*, how they allow the principle which Mr. Pope advocates to spread throughout the land. If every man is to be allowed to think for himself on matters of faith, it will then come to be

asked, why do we pay £800,000 a year for the maintenance of an *useless clergy?* "Let us fling away the tithes," it will be said—these men have, on their own showing, no right to dictate to us on matters of religion—and as we do not want them, why should we be so enormously taxed for their support." Such will be the consequences, if the Protestant clergy, instead of opposing, actually countenance and support the principles advocated by Mr. Pope. What says a Protestant Clergyman, the Rev. Mr. O'Callaghan, upon this subject?

"When Mr. Pope and Dr. Singer, men indeed of high character, and by far the ablest advocates of the Bible Society, at least in Ireland—when men of this description, *dangerous* in proportion to their great intellectual and literary calibre, are led away by the prevailing delusion, and not ashamed to tell the world that 'the right of an ignorant labourer to read the Bible, involves his right of interpreting it'—why is the church silent? Why does she not address them in her proper organ, if such still exist, to the following effect:—'Reverend brethren, your argument is fallacious, and it is our bounden duty to tell you so. Most true it is that a poor labourer has a right to read the Bible for the health of his soul, and to bathe in the sea for the health of his body. His right to bathe is as clear as his right to read—his right to go into the water also implies his right to swim; but if he swim very imperfectly, or not at all, we hope you will allow that his efforts to swim would be dangerous, nay, fatal, and that he should not proceed more than chin-deep.

"You friends of Christianity beware of Bible Societies every where—you friends of peace and good-will among men beware of Bible Societies, and other proselytizing associations, especially in Ireland? Remember their great principle that has nearly extinguished Christianity in what is called Protestant Germany—be wise in time, farewell!!"

Mr. O'Callaghan, a gentleman of talents and extensive information says, that the right of private judgment is not recognised in the church of England. Here we have a Protestant ecclesiastic arrayed against the doctrine which is preached up by Mr. Pope, who is a Protestant, but not an *ecclesiastic*. Mr. Pope has spoken of infidelity being a consequence of Popery. I hold in my hand a sermon preached by the Rev. Mr. Rose in the college of Cambridge, and dedicated to the bishop of Chester; in this sermon he thus describes the state of Protestant Germany:—

"From the state of Protestantism in Germany, a stronger, and perhaps more important lesson is offered on that subject, which is said to form the *base* and the *boast* of Protestantism—the right of private judgment. The terrible evils resulting in the German church from its exercise, are the strongest practical proof of the wisdom and necessity of restraining it. Among the German divines it is a favourite doctrine that it is impossible there could have been a miracle, and the words of scripture are examined and forced into any meaning but their own. By some the miracles are said to be, that mythology which must attend every religion to gain the attention of the multitude; by some the common and well known ribaldry of the infidel is unsparingly used; by one or more, high in station in the church, some artifice, and probably magnetism has been, even within the last ten years, suggested; others go so far as to attack the whole body of the prophets as impostors, in most outrageous and revolting terms. This doctrine is taught by divines from the pulpit—by professors from the chairs of theology—it is

addressed to the old to free them from ancient prejudices, and to the young as the knowledge which can make them truly wise. This abdication of Christianity is not confined either to the Lutheran or Calvinist profession, but extends its baneful and withering influence with baneful force over each. It is curious to observe in what way they get rid of all miracles. Professor Paulus, in his Critical Commentary assures us, that the man with the withered hand had only a luxation of the shoulder, which Jesus perceiving pulled it into joint."

Professor Schultness explains this miracle as follows:

"The man had a severe rheumatism; Christ observing that his blood was much moved, by the indignation with which he heard the question of the Pharisees, said to him in that favorable moment, "Stretch out thine hand;' the man attempted to do it, and was healed because that extraordinary excitement had removed the impediment under which he laboured. When Christ restored sight to the blind man, the poor fellow had such weakness in his eye-lids, that he could not keep his eyes open. Christ observing that he never made the attempt to open them, said to him, 'Thou shalt open thine eyes;' the confidence of the man was so great, that making the attempt with all his might, he opened his eyes. Christ never walked in the waves, but on the shore, or he swam behind the ship, or he walked through the shallows. The daughter of Jairus was not dead, because Christ himself said 'She sleepeth.' When Jesus said to Peter, 'Thou shalt catch a fish, and find in his mouth a piece of money,' the meaning is, before you can sell it for so much, you must open its mouth and take out the hook. At Cana in Galilee, Jesus gave a nuptial present of very fine wine, with which, for a joke, he filled the water-pots of stone. The paralytic was an idle fellow, who for thirty years had moved neither hand nor foot. Christ asked him ironically, 'Perhaps thou wouldst be whole?' This irony stirred him up;—he forgot his hypocrisy."

But let us for a moment look at home; see the numerous sects spread throughout the land—the Seekers, the Jumpers, the Methodists, the Southcotonians, &c, &c; all differing more from each other, than does the Catholic from the Protestant church. They afford a rare specimen of that chaos of reform, that Babel of interpretation, which is generated by the exercise of private judgment.

A question has been put to me, as to the means by which I would attempt to convert the pagan; I will tell you in plain terms the course I would adopt. I would present him with the Bible; he would ask what book that was? I would tell him that it was inspired by God, and left by him to man as a help towards the salvation of his soul, and to instruct him in doctrine and morality. He would then inquire by what means I knew that this was the book of God. I would, in reply, address him as a rational man; I would tell him that the author of that book had descended from heaven—had taken upon him the figure of mortal man—that he declared himself the Messiah of God, and the Redeemer come to save the world, and that he proved his divine mission by the most astonishing miracles that ever yet were wrought. He would then ask, how did I know those facts occurred, and that such miracles were performed I would

appeal to the positive evidence of contemporary writers, whom for the moment I should not consider inspired. I would appeal to the scripture as an historical record. I would show that it possessed historical truth—that the Jews never controverted its accuracy. I would, in fine, appeal to the common consent of mankind, to the inhabitants of distant and different nations subject to different passions, manners, and habits, speaking quite different languages, and having no communication, verbal or written. I would ask him, was he ready to believe, that all those individuals, historians, and nations, had conspired to attest a deliberate falsehood, to impose upon the whole world, and of course upon their children, and children's children, a book purporting to be the work of God, but in reality a book of lies, falsehood, and false miracles? As soon as I convinced him that Christ wrought the miracles, attributed to him in that book, (and how could he doubt these miracles, when they were admitted both by Jews and Gentiles?) I would point out to him the many clear, manifest, and obvious texts in scripture, by which a church was proved to be founded and established by Christ, and endowed *with authority to teach*, and the most solemn assurances that it would never *teach error*. I would prove from clear and obvious texts of scripture, and more clear and obvious texts could not be quoted in support of any doctrine of the Christian religion, that the church of Christ could never teach error to mankind. He would then have only to examine these texts as to the alleged authority of the church, and, this one truth admitted, all his doubts and difficulties upon these points would instantly disappear. The quibbles and objections raised by the deists against the sacred volume would vanish in a trice; and conscious of his own incapacity, and having no alternative but to submit to authority, or by renouncing authority *to reject all mysteries, he would follow the church, as a safe and certain guide.* But how would Mr. Pope convert the pagan. Mr. Pope would tell him that the Bible is the book of God. The pagan will naturally ask him, how does he know it to be such? Mr. Pope, in reply, would appeal to a certain illumination of the spirit—a rather uncertain standard, it must be allowed, for a poor ignorant unconverted pagan. It is an argument, to say the least of it *ad absurdum.*

Mr. Pope must then have recourse to authorities. This is all I want. If he receive the Bible as the work of God, upon authority, then he establishes the necessity of authority in the Christian world. If then, he says that he cannot *otherwise* prove the inspiration of the sacred scriptures: then I ask him, how can an act of supernatural faith be founded upon human fallible authority. The infidel, on the contrary, when converted

by a Catholic, receives in baptism a divine habitual grace whereby he is enabled to believe in the authority of the church, from the passages which I have already cited, and which prove the existence of a church, and its infallibility. I defy Mr. Pope to produce passages half so clear in support of any single doctrine of Christianity. Did he produce any passage so clear in support *of his rule of faith?* St. Paul tells us to avoid a heretic, as 'being condemned by his private judgment." Proprio judicio condemnatus, is the language of the Latin Vulgate; and it is admitted by many learned Protestants, to be the best translation of the scriptures extant. Even St. John tells us not to salute a heretic, "nec ave ei dixeritis." Will Mr. Pope convince any one of the inspiration of the scriptures, but on human authority alone. Now, "faith comes from hearing, and hearing from the words of Christ." Mr. Pope's faith is therefore grounded on human authority, and not on divine inspiration. The Socinian comes to Mr. Pope, (and here I would solicit your particular attention to this point,) and says, I agree with you in your principle of private judgment—I agree with you that the scriptures are the inspired word of God; but you, Mr. Pope, have corrupted the sense of the scriptures. You put upon them an interpretation which they will not, cannot bear. You admit articles of faith which are opposed to the scriptures, and contrary to common sense. You hold in common with me that there is no way of judging or interpreting the sacred scriptures, except, according to private judgment, or, in other words, common sense. Again, you say, that a woman conceived an infant through a supernatural agency. Here also is a romantic interpretation, quite impervious to reason and to common sense. You should, (concludes the Socinian,) you should understand all those texts in a figurative sense. Mr. Pope will then recur to various passages of scripture to prove the divinity of Christ; but when he urges his interpretation against that of the *consistent* Socinian, the latter will contend for his equal right to interpret them; and he will justly inquire, is no man but Mr. Pope to be allowed to exercise the right of private judgment? I have as good a right to believe in the existence of an infallible church, and the Socinian as good a right to maintain his own interpretation, and reject all mysteries, as Mr. Pope has to believe in his principles. When Mr. Pope endeavours to urge his interpretation on the Socinian he abandons his own principles. Mr. Pope has no right to blame any man for having exercised his private judgment. Or is that a privilege to be exercised *exclusively* by the "saints" and the "elect?" Let Mr. Pope get out of the predicament if he can. If he can clear up that difficulty, he will indeed be a 'Magnus Apollo.' Let him quit quibbling

about councils and come directly to the word of God—"No prophecy of scripture is made by private interpretation." 2 Peter, i, 20. I challenge Mr. Pope to show how a Protestan can make an act of faith. But the Catholic who believes in the church *established by Christ*, founds his faith upon the authority of that church. All difficulties vanish before him,—the atheist or the deist may start several objections which he cannot answer, but "the church is the solution of all difficulties." Mr. Pope inquires how I can get out of the vicious circle, in which he says I am involved, by proving the existence of the church upon the authority of the scriptures, and proving the authority of the scriptures upon that of the church.

Mark my answer.—I prove the authority of the church by passages of scripture, *not denied* by Mr. Pope,—by passages of scripture which are held in common by all Christians. I presume Mr. Pope believes in the four gospels: now I appeal to the four gospels, and to the first epistle of St. Paul to Timothy, to prove that Jesus Christ endowed his church with the glorious privilege of infallibility. Mr. Pope admits the four gospels, and St. Paul's epistle to be genuine. Having proved therefore the authority of the church from those books of scripture *acknowledged* by Mr. Pope; I then prove upon the authority of that church already established, the inspiration of the other books which are *not acknowledged* by Mr. Pope. Where now, gentleman, is the vicious circle? I have another method of breaking this *magical* ring—of opening this *vicious circle*—I will reveal it, in the hope that the "*circle*" will never be proposed as an argument against the Catholic church again. I take the book of the New Testament in my hand, and for a moment, not considering it to be inspired, I produce it as a genuine and faithful historical relation of the occurrences of the times in which Jesus Christ lived. I learn from this book that a man appeared then upon earth, who called himself the Son of God: I find it there recorded that he performed innumerable miracles in the open day, and in presence of his most inveterate enemies—that he raised a man called Lazarus to life, whose body was nearly rotten in the grave, and that he performed many other and extraordinary miracles, "If I had not (says our Lord,) done among them the works that no other man hath done, they would not have sin in them."—(John xv, 24.) I find from this historical relation that Christ established a church upon earth, to which he made ample and extraordinary promises—that he would remain with his church all days, even unto the consummation of the world—that he would send the Paraclete to guide it in the way—that he would build it upon a rock—that it would be the pillar and the ground of truth, and that the gates of hell shall never prevail against it. I take

this as a mere history, and if we are to admi istory, I find it there recorded, that Christ proved his mission by numerous miracles. I thus prove the *authority* of the *church* upon the authority of *Christ's miracles* attested by the strongest historical evidence—to wit, the historical evidence of the scriptures, and I then prove that the scriptures are inspired upon the authority of the church. There is the solution of what Mr. Pope calls a vicious circle. But I feel confident, that Mr. Pope will find a rather a hard matter to extricate himself from the circle in which I have him enclosed.

Mr. Pope—Mr. Maguire has not spoken of the Rev. Joseph Blanco White in the most complimentary terms. I beg to assure Mr. Maguire, that those who are personally acquainted with Mr. White, describe him as a worthy and excellent man. I could name a gentleman who is not very far distant from this platform, a reformed priest, who has *published* the nature of the conversation which, he asserts from his own knowledge, is interchanged when priests meet together. I shall not pollute my lips by mentioning it. As to the repentance of the people of Nineveh, I would ask, is God satisfied with the external expressions of sorrow? Does he not say, "rend your hearts and not your garments, and turn to the Lord your God?" With the character of Henry the Eighth I have little to do. Providence 'tis true, employed him as an instrument, for the accomplishment of important purposes. Henry, indeed, denied the Pope's supremacy; but there is no reason to doubt that he died a Roman Catholic in principle. Mr. Maguire has eulogized Mr. O'Callaghan. Mr. O'Callaghan, I must be allowed to say, is not the organ of Protestant opinion. I grant that infidelity exists in Germany; but I would ask, what is the difference between the state of so iety in that country and in Spain? Infidelity in the latter country is afraid to give utterance to its opinions; in Germany it speaks out. Is it not more honorable to *profess* scepticism, than to cloak beneath the garb of hypocrisy an atheistical heart? I shall reserve my observations on the divisions which Mr. Maguire remarks, exist among Protestants, till we come to the subject of unity. In proof that the Bible is the word of God, my friend closes it, and appeals to external evidence—to the universal consent of mankind; and *requires the individual to believe on his testimony*, that the universal consent of mankind is in support of the inspired records. In order to discover the universal consent of mankind, is the pagan, I would ask, to read all the histories that exist? Does not Mr. Maguire, in truth, appeal to the private judgment of the man? Does he not adopt that mode of reasoning which he

professes to condemn? Is it not apparent that Mr. Maguire will have a much more troublesome task than I shall have? I have not to prove the infallibility of any church. I let the Bible speak for itself. Mr. Maguire ridicules the idea of an internal illumination, and asks, how can a man know whether he possesses that inward light? I answer,

"The fruits of the Spirit are charity, joy, peace, patience, benignity, goodness, love, amity, mildness, faith, modesty, continency, chastity."—Gal. v, 22, 23.

Where the fruits of the Spirit are, there the Holy Spirit dwells

"If any man will do the will of God, he shall know whether the doctrine be of God or not," says the Saviour.—John, vii, 17.

My friend asks, how can a man make an act of faith upon human authority! I answer, I do not make an act of faith on human authority, while I maintain that Mr. Maguire does so. Mr. Maguire observes, that he would first regard the scriptures merely as an historical record and that as such they will convince his judgment that his church is infallible. I must be allowed to assert, that in thus appealing to the gospels *as merely historical authority*, and building upon them, as such, the infallibility of the church of Rome, Mr. Maguire acknowledges that her claim to infallibility rests only upon human authority. So that Mr. Maguire makes an act of faith in the infallibility of his church according to his own views, *merely upon human authority*. I am sure that the Roman Catholic Hierarchy will be much indebted to Mr. Maguire for this disclosure.

As to grace being necessarily conferred at baptism, it is mere assertion. In proof of the opposite opinion, we have only to refer to the conduct of children. Do we discover every child who has been baptized, evincing the influence of divine grace in his temper and conduct? By no means. The existence of the immoral practices of which children are guilty, is a direct refutation of Mr. Maguire's position, that every child receives grace at baptism.

Mr. Maguire says, that no doctrine is so clearly proved in scripture as the infallibility of the church of Rome. Millions are of a contrary opinion. Had God really revealed the infallibility of the church of Rome, we can scarcely imagine but that he would have made it known in such broad and legible characters, that he that runs might read it. I should like to know, where the Pope is mentioned in the Bible? 'Tis not an act of saving faith, to believe merely that a book has proceeded from God. I exercise saving faith, when I exercise it upon the truths of salvation contained in the scriptures.

I make an act of faith, not on the testimony of man, but on the authority of God. I believe the blessed truth, "the blood

of Jesus Christ cleanseth from all sin,' because I see such an intrinsic glory in the scheme of redemption, as convinces me that God is its author. With respect to the pagan, I have shown you, that he can receive the Bible as inspired, without the aid of external evidence—the sacred volume itself bearing witness of its own divinity, and having the impress of heaven stamped upon it.

As to the question of the Socinian, it has been canvassed in our letters, which are already before the public. When, I believe, that my view of a particular subject is correct, and that of a fellow-man erroneous, I surely do not interfere with his private judgment, in endeavouring by argument to effect a change in his views. I appeal to his judgment, in order to convince him of his error. I would not, I could not force his judgment; but I would endeavour by argument to carry conviction to his mind. An individual, surely, may be convinced of the soundness of his opinion without laying claim to infallibility. I believe, indeed, that the man who holds not the divinity of Christ is in fatal error. I believe, that, if he continue under its influence, he will perish; and I would use my exertions to reclaim him. Reason, we must remember, has its legitimate province. A doctrine may be *above* our reason, and *not opposed* to it. God has not revealed the *modus* of his existence; *that* we are not called upon to believe. He has simply revealed the truth, that a trinity of persons exists in the one Godhead; that truth we are called upon to believe. Let us bear in mind the infinite distance between the great Supreme and the narrow capacity of man. Shall we, poor worms of the earth, who know but little of ourselves, who are but of yesterday, shall we bring to the bar of our finite intellects the nature of the infinite and eternal God? Study the revelation which Deity has given of himself, and you will perceive that the Father, Son, and Spirit respectively sustain, in the great scheme of redemption, offices to which none but a divine person could be adequate.

How does Mr. Maguire endeavor to convince the Socinian? By the authority of his church. "I deny in toto," replies the Socinian "her infallibility; how can I argue with you, who refuse an appeal to common sense, to scripture, and to fact, for all these overthrow the supposed infallibility of your church?" On the other hand, I entertain some hope, that arguing on the principles of private judgment, I shall be enabled, under the divine blessing, to convince the man who will not listen to Mr. Maguire. I argue upon authority—the sacred scriptures—*which the Socinian admits;* Mr. Maguire argues with him *on ground which he will not acknowledge*—the infallibility of the church of Rome.

Mr. Maguire has asked, how could an ignorant Protestant perform an act of faith? Blessed be God; many poor can do so. God hath chosen not a few individuals who are "poor in this world, to be rich in faith, and heirs of the kingdom." Mr. Maguire has referred to a passage in Peter. It runs thus, "No *prophecy* of scripture is made by private interpretation." Douay, 2 Pet. i, 20, (ἰδίας ἐπιλύσεως,) or, as it may be translated, "no prophecy of scripture is its own intrepreter;" we are to intrepret prophecy by the analogy of scripture. Can we imagine that St. Peter did not wish those whom he addressed, to give attention to the scripture, when in the 19th verse he says, "We have the more firm prophetical word, whereunto *you do well to attend*, as to a light that shineth in a dark place?" Whom does the Apostle exhort? His epistle is not addressed to ecclesiastics exclusively, but "to them that have obtained equal faith with us in the justice of our God and Saviour Jesus Christ." And it is worthy of notice, that in the second epistle, in which the words that we are considering stand, there is no mention whatsoever made of any ecclesiastical officer.

In the Apocalypse I find the following passage,—

"Blessed is he that readeth and heareth the words of *this prophecy*."

Mr. Maguire has referred to the Apocrypha. It is remarkable that Mr. Maguire and his church should, on the canonicity of the Apocrypha, be at issue with those whose authority he professes to venerate. In the fourth century, we have the catalogues of Jerome, *secretary to pope Damasus* (in Præfat ad Libr. Regum sive Prologo Galeato,) and of Rufinus, (Expositio ad Symb. Apost.) most accurately agreeing with the Protestant canon, and rejecting the Apocrypha.

Rufinus writes as follows:

"This, then, is the Holy Spirit, who in the Old Testament inspired the law and the prophets, and in the New the gospels and the Apostles. Wherefore the Apostle says, that 'all scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine.'—2 Tim. iii, 16. It will not, therefore, be improper to enumerate here the books of the New and Old Testament, which we find by the monuments of the Fathers to have been delivered to the churches as inspired by the Holy Spirit. And of the Old Testament, in the first place, are the five books of Moses, Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy. After these are Joshua, the son of Nun, and the Judges, together with Ruth. Next the four books of the kingdoms, which the Hebrews reckon two, the book of the Remains, which is called the Chronicles, and two books of Ezra, which by them are reckoned one, and Esther. The prophets are Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Daniel, and besides one book of the twelve prophets. Job also, and the Psalms of David. Solomon has left three books to the churches, the Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and the Song of Songs; with these they conclude the number of the books of the Old Testament. Of the New there are the four gospels of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John; the Acts of the Apostles, by Luke; fourteen epistles of the Apostle Paul; two epistles of the Apostle Peter; one of James, the brother of the Lord and

Apostle; one of Jude; three of John; the Revelation of John. These are the volumes which the Fathers have included in the canon, and out of which they would have us prove the doctrines of our faith.

"However, it ought to be observed, that there are also other books which are not canonical, but have been called by our forefathers ecclesiastical, as the Wisdom of Solomon; and another, which is called the Wisdom of the son of Sirach, and among the Latins is called by the general name of Ecclesiasticus: by which title is denoted, not the author of the book, but the quality of the writing. In the same rank is the book of Tobit and Judith, and the books of the Maccabees."—In Symb. Apost. ap. Cyprian in App. p. 26, 27. et ap. Hieron. t. v. p. 141, 142.

St Jerome, secretary to Pope Damasus, writes thus—

"The Hebrews have two and twenty letters; and they have as many books of divine doctrine for the instruction of mankind. The first book is called by them Bereshith, by us Genesis; the second is called Exodus; the third Leviticus; the fourth Numbers; the fifth Deuteronomy. These are the five books of Moses, which they call Thora, the Law.

"The second class contains the prophets, which they begin with the book of Joshua, the son of Nun. The next is the book of Judges, with which they join Ruth; her history happening in the time of the Judges. The third is Samuel, which we call the first and second book of the kingdoms. The fourth is the book of Kings, or, the third and fourth book of the kingdoms, or rather of the Kings; for they do not contain the history of many nations, but of the people of Israel, only consisting of twelve tribes. The fifth is Isaiah; the sixth Jeremiah; the seventh Ezekiel; the eighth the book of the twelve Prophets.

"The third class is that of hagiographa, or sacred writings: the first of which is Job; the second David, of which they make one volume, called the Psalms, divided into five parts; the third is Solomon, of which there are three books; the Proverbs, or Parables, as they call them, the Ecclesiastes, and the Song of Songs; the sixth is Daniel; the seventh is the Chronicles, consisting with us of two books, called the first and second of the Remains; the eighth is Ezra, which among the Greeks and Latins makes two books; the ninth is Esther.

"Thus there are in all two and twenty books of the old Law; that is five books of Moses, eight of the Prophets, and nine of the Hagiographa. But some reckon Ruth and the Lamentations among the Hagiographa, so there will be four and twenty.

"The prologue I write as a preface to all the books to be translated by me from the Hebrew into Latin, *that we may know that all the books which are not of this number, are to be reckoned apocryphal:* therefore, Wisdom, which is commonly called Solomon's, and the book of Jesus, the son of Sirach, and Judith, and Tobit, and the Shepherd are not in the canon. The first book of Maccabees, I have found in Hebrew; the second is Greek, as is evident from the style."—In Prol. Gal. seu. Præfat. de Omnib. Libr. V. T. Tom. i, p. 317—322. ed. Bened. "As therefore, the church readeth Judith and Tobit, and the books of the Maccabees, but does not receive them among the canonical scriptures; so likewise it may read these two books (the book of Jesus, the son of Sirach, and the Wisdom of Solomon) for the edification of the people, but not as of authority for proving any doctrine of religion"—Præf in libr. Salom. t. i, p. 938. 939.

I state upon the authority of Josephus and Bellarmine that the Jews never received the Apocrypha.—(Joseph. Cont. Apion, l. i, c. 8. ap. Euseb. Eccl. l. iii, c. 9, 10.—Bellarm. Lib. i, De Verbo Dei, c. 10.) It is also worthy of notice, that there are contradictions in the Apocrypha to the canonical books. I am

inclined to suspect, that one reason which induces the church of Rome to admit the Apocrypha, is, that they contain a passage or two which savor of purgatory. In Maccabees (1. vi, 16--2. i, 16. ix, 28.) we are informed that king Antiochus died three times over!! In 2 Macc. xiv, 42, suicide is commended. The author of the second book of Maccabees concludes in the following manner:

"I also will here make an end of my narration; which if I have done well, and as it becometh the history, it is what I desired; but if not so perfectly, it must be pardoned me."—xv, 39.

Does such language intimate that the author believed that he had written an inspired book? External and internal evidence will prove that the Apocrypha is not canonical. It is a well known fact, that in the time of Jerome, the Roman church did not receive the epistle to the Hebrews as canonical, while all the churches in the East received it.—She receives it now. Wha shall we think of her consistency? St. Jerome observes, that

"Although formerly all the churches in the east did receive the epistles to the Hebrews as canonical, yet it was not received as canonical in the Latin (or Roman) church."—In Js. c. 6. Et Ep. 29. ad. Evag. Tom. iii.

Jerome did not submit to the judgment of the church of Rome He says,

"Although the Latin (or Roman) church doth not admit this epistle as canonical, we notwitstanding do receive it."—Ibid.

My friend has referred to the passage of St. Augustin—

"I would not believe the gospel except the authority of the Catholic church moved me thereto."

We are informed that St. Augustin, at the head of a number of African bishops, wrote letters to the Pope of Rome resisting the claim of appeals made by three Popes.—(Conc. Afric. apud. Surium. p. 59.) We may rest assured, therefore, that in the passage which Mr. Maguire has cited, Augustin did not refer to the authority of the church of Rome, an authority which he himself opposed. Permit me to make a few observations on the passage to which Mr. Maguire has called our attention. It is probable that Augustin speaks hypothetically, not in reference to his then state of mind, but as if he was yet halting between Manichean principles, and those of the gospel, using *crederem pro credidissem, commoveret pro commovisset*, a change of tense not unusual with some of the fathers. I beg to give you the views of some eminent Roman Catholic writers upon this passage: some refer the saying of Augustin, not to the present church but to the church in the time of the Apostles. Thus Durandus de St. Sourçain after having quoted the words of Augustin, observes,

"This passage which treats of *the* APPROVAL *of the scriptures by the church*

applies solely to the church in the times of the Apostles, which was filled with the Holy Spirit, and besides saw the miracles of Christ, and heard his doctrine, and on that account was a fit witness of the things which Christ both did and said."—Durand in 3 Sent. Dist. 24, Q. i, fol, 169,

Again, Gerson, commenting on this passage of Augustin, observes :

"By the council, Augustin means the primitive assemblies of those who had seen and heard Christ, and had been his witness."—De vita Spirit. animar. Lect. 2, corol. 7, part 3, fol. 322.

The view of the celebrated cardinal De Aliaco is as follows :

(In lib. Sentent. art. iii, fol. 49, 59.) After having observed that 'the principles of theology are the truths of the sacred canon, because from them is made the ultimate solution of theological discourse,"

He remarks, in reference to this very saying of St. Augustin.

"*It is not proved by the authority of St. Augustin, that he believed in the gospel by the authority of the church as a principle of theology, by which it could be proved theologically, that the gospel is true, but only as the first moving cause which led him to the faith of the gospel.* As if he or any other had said, I would not trust in the gospel, if the sanctity of the church, and the miracles of Christ had not moved me, in which saying, although there be assigned some reason for a belief in the gospel, it is not entirely a first principle."

These quotations will serve, I trust, to throw some light upon the passage. I would beg to remind my friend, that if it were not capable of an easy and natural explanation, the Bible, and the Bible alone is the religion of Protestants. The testimony of St. Augustin is of no weight beyond the boundaries of truth. I have shown, however, that the meaning of Augustin's words is different from that which Mr. Maguire ascribes to them ; and the comment of Augustin himself on the fourth chapter of John (Tract xvi, 23,) seems beautifully to elucidate his meaning :—

"The woman first told the Samaritans, and they believed upon her testimony, and asked the Saviour to remain with them. He remained two days, and more believed. And when they had believed, they said to the woman, "We now believe, not for thy saying, for we ourselves have heard him, and know that this is indeed the Saviour of the world," first, by report, afterwards by the presence of Christ."—"Primum per famam, postea per præsentiam."

Augustin adds :

"So now it happeneth with those who are out of the church and not yet Christians. Christ is taught by Christian friends, as it were by the woman, that is by the church's instruction. *They come to Christ* and believe by the report; and many more and with more confidence believe, that he is the Saviour of the world."

The mere testimony of man may be the first exciting cause of drawing the mind towards the scriptures ; but does that testimony therefore become infallible ? Does a man, *who receives the record that God has given concerning his Son*, though his attention may have been first attracted to the inspired records by the testimony of a fellow-creature, exercise an act of faith on

human authority? By no means. Were all the churches and all the inhabitants of the world to assert, that a particular volume was a revelation from God, if that volume contained an immoral code, palpable contradictions, or statements, plainly derogatory to the character of God, I could not receive it as divine.

Mr. MAGUIRE—My friend commenced by asserting that Christ did not pronounce his Apostles infallible, because Judas betrayed his master. This fact only proves that he did not promise them the quality of impeccability, but by no means proves that he did not promise them infallibility in matters of faith. Though Judas betrayed his master, he did not deny the faith—he committed the sin for money, and he supposed that his maste would escape from his enemies. Though he betrayed his master, he was guilty of no breach of faith. I called on Mr. Pope to show how a Protestant, literate or illiterate, can make an act of faith or of belief in the divine inspiration of the sacred scriptures. Mr. Pope says that the language of the scriptures carries about it internal evidence sufficient to convince. Are those, to whom he gives the scriptures, learned enough to discover this fact? He talked of an internal illumination, and how a person upon a sudden comes upon the light of the gospel. Is there a scholar present who does not feel that Mr. Pope has not approached the difficulty? How will the poor and the illiterate ascertain the truth of scripture from the manner in which they are conveyed? May not the poor and ignorant man continue, as St. Augustin did before his conversion, to *laugh* at the sacred volume? But *after* his conversion, St. Augustin tells of the veneration he paid to that noblest of all works, the sacred scriptures. St. Augustin, be it remembered, was converted by the preaching and teaching of St. Ambrose, and *not* by reading the Bible. How will the new convert from Paganism receive the grace of the Holy Ghost? The grace of the Holy Ghost is not communicated until after baptism has been conferred. Look at Cornelius the centurion. If in his moral habits and good life he exhibited a portion of God's mercy, he did not receive the visible marks of the Holy Ghost until after his baptism. Nor did the Samaritans exhibit the marks of that divine grace, till they were baptized. It would be more difficult to bring home to the conviction of a pagan the proofs of that internal evidence of the scriptures of which Mr. Pope speaks, than the proofs of their inspiration. Mr. Pope wants to prove the inspiration of the scriptures to the pagan, by a thing which is in itself more difficult of proof. With regard to the Socinian, how does Mr. Pope act? "I lay down," says he, "certain texts of scripture—they are wrongly interpreted by the Socinian;

but I did not force his judgment." Mr. Pope, thank God cannot force the judgment of any individual; but my observations was, that Mr. Pope could not urge any interpretation at all upon the Socinian, without violating the principle of private judgment. The Socinian may retort on Mr. Pope, and tell him that his interpretation of the scriptures is false. The Socinian may say, "I exercise my reason, and *you* surely will not find fault with me for doing so. The position that three make one, and one makes three, is perfectly above human comprehension. Do you require me to admit things which are quite inconceivable? You do not, of course, desire that I should abandon my reason, and as to internal evidence?—it is a thing neither known to you, nor to any one else." Such would be the answer of the Socinian to Mr. Pope. I, on the other hand, might not be able to convert the Socinian, but he could not say that I contradicted myself. I would deny to the Socinian the right to interpret the scriptures by private judgment. That would be leaving the word of God dependent on the whim and caprice of every individual. The word of God, I maintain, depends for its interpretation on the church—that church which is the collection of the churches of the same communion, scattered through the world—that church over which Christ appointed St. Peter to preside, giving to him the keys of the kingdom of heaven, promising that whatever he loosed on earth, should be loosed in heaven, and whatever he bound on earth, should be bound in heaven. Have all those churches conspired throughout all ages to give a wrong interpretation to the scriptures? or have they conspired to give a false meaning to any particular text? See the unanimous consent of different and distant nations on the subject. Is not that unanimous agreement a better proof of the truth of the interpretation, and of *its having descended from the Apostles*, than the varying and capricious judgment of each individual? Mr. Pope does not say that he is infallible, yet he endeavours with all the presumption of infallibility to force his interpretation of the scriptures on the Socinian. Compare Mr. Pope's interpretation with the agreement of all nations—with that *quod universa tenet ecclesia*. Here are many churches and different nations all agreeing in a particular interpretation and specified articles of faith, for eighteen hundred years. Are not their opinions more worthy of adoption, than the whims and follies of individuals? My friend has quoted some of the holy Fathers—I would advise him to act as Luther did, and throw them overboard. The Fathers, he will find, are quite against him. I could quote thirty different Fathers, who strongly condemn the exercise of private judgment. St. Augustin, in his book Contra Faustum 11, tome vi, p. 183, says

"These, so many and so great ties bind the believing man to the Catholic church. The consent of nations; the regular succession of bishops from Peter, to whom Christ committed the care of his sheep, down to the present bishop of Rome; lastly, the name of Catholic itself. But unless the authority of this church induced me to it, I would not believe the Gospel. As then I obey those who say to me, 'Believe the Gospel;' so why should I not obey them when they say to me, 'Believe not the Manichæans.'"

"This church, moreover, the divine authority commends, and as it *cannot deceive us*, he who fears to be imposed on will consult the church, which without any ambiguity, the scriptures establish."—Contra Cresconium Lib. , tom. 7, p. 168.

And again—"Do thou run to the tabernacle of God, hold fast to the Catholic church; do not depart from that rule of truth, and thou shalt be protected in the tabernacle from the contradiction of tongues."—Ennarratio tertia in psalmum 30, tom. viii, p. 74.

I quote from genuine editions of the Fathers. I do not advance corrupted passages. Let Mr. Pope show me in a genuine edition any passage in which St. Augustin refused to hold communion with the church of Rome. Mr. Pope, in urging his interpretation of the scriptures upon the Socinian, would never succeed. The Socinian would say, "I have as good a right as you, Mr. Pope, to the exercise of my private judgment, and reason is on my side." I might not be more felicitious in my attempts to convert the Socinian. I would not, however, contradict my own principles. I would refer him to the consent of mankind through many ages. I would shame him, if he were a reasonable man, into conviction. I would take the Socinian by the throat—Mr. Pope could not even take him by the heels. Has Mr. Pope explained how it happens that Protestants must remain in many instances actual infidels, for several years after they have arrived at the age of discretion. The Protestant child cannot receive the Bible on the authority of Mr. Pope. When he opens the sacred volume, he finds passages in it which may make him believe it not to be the work of God. There are more passages to be found in it of that description, than Mr Pope could point out in what he considers the Apocrypha. But I hold the book in which they are found to be of divine inspiration; and if I cannot understand them, I resign my judgment to the church. But the Protestant child must remain an infidel. For to doubt of Christianity, is absolute infidelity. The Roman Catholic child, when baptized, receives the aid of the Holy Ghost. He promises at baptism to obey the church; and I proved the object of his obedience entitled to it. But the illumination of which Mr. Pope speaks, never can be proved. It is adapted only to sublimated imaginations. It is unfortunate that Mr. Pope appeals to the Bible to decide our controversy—for the Bible is a dumb judge. Our Lord says to his apostles—

"Go ye therefore, and teach all nations; baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Teaching them to

observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you; and behold I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world."—Matt. xxviii, 19, 20

Again—"Go ye into the whole world and preach the Gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not, shall be condemned."—Mark xvi, 15, 16.

Here our Lord plainly tells us, that he who receives their preaching, when baptized shall be saved. Where is the object of Mr. Pope's faith? He cannot make the mere book the object of his faith. He cannot invest the translators with infallibility. He will not surely give that title to Beza, and others. Every thing in the Protestant church, and in Mr. Pope's lay church, is fallible. How can an immoveable structure be raised upon a moveable foundation? Mr. Pope illustrated one of his arguments, by placing one book on the top of another The illustration may be appropriately and happily applied in this instance. Here are two books, which we shall suppose to represent the scriptures and private judgment. The Protestant child must read the scriptures upon the authority of private judgment, and *vice versa*, he must sustain private judgment upon the scriptures. He must capsize one to support the other. If the Protestant church be liable to error, how can any man confide his faith in it? And even if the church be supposed fallible, would it not be cruel to deprive the poor and ignorant of their only guide, they themselves being unable to investigate. But the Catholic church being infallible, the Catholic rests his faith with security on its authority. The consent of mankind for many ages is in support of the Catholic church. A single witness may be suborned, but millions cannot be bribed. I propose the following syllogistic argument to Mr. Pope, in reference to his faith. That faith cannot be divine which is founded upon human authority—now his faith is founded upon human authority, therefore it cannot be divine. There is a wonderful coincidence between the opinion of Luther, and the opinion of Mr. Pope, respecting the Apostles. They want to do away with the infallibility of the Apostles, and they confound impeccability with infallibility. Luther, in a German work, which I hold in my hand, and in another translated into Latin by Jonas Justus, at Luther's own request, speaking of the Apostles and Fathers, says—"The Apostles were great sinners, ignorant men, and precious rogues," or in the original. "Die Apostel seynd auck grosse Siinder geweszt, unde gute, grobe, grosse schælck." He says, "Even Paul himself was not so sure of his doctrine, and often doubted, whether he preached the truth or not." "St. Jerome was a heretic"—"St. Chrysostom was a prattler," and ridiculing the intercession of saints, he dares to blaspheme his God: "I beseech you, oh! my dea

little devil, that you intercede with God for me; my dear little devil, pray to God for me."

I now call on Mr. Pope to make the Bible speak, and thus decide the difference between us. If he does not do so, according to his principles, Christ has appointed a dumb judge to decide upon all differences between man and man. But our Saviour knew human nature too well to leave every individual to follow his own whim and caprice. If man be thus sent adrift without any certain guide to direct him in the way of salvation, it would be rather hard that he should be called to an account on the last day. I ask if Mr. Pope had an estate at stake, would he not employ a lawyer to direct him in his difficulties, would he not, instead of exercising his own private judgment on the Act of Parliament, leave it to the interpretation and decision of his legal adviser? He wisely relinquishes his private judgment and he saves his estate; what does St. Paul mean when he speaks of "captivating every understanding?"—2 Cor. x, 5. Innumerable are the evils which result from depriving the lower orders, of that authority upon which alone their faith can be founded? Mr. Pope says that the declarations of Christ are obvious and plain. I wish to know by what means the Protestant can ascertain that *they are the declarations of Christ.* Let Mr. Pope quit the foolish doctrine of internal illumination Arius appealed to internal illumination—so did all the heretics—so did, in latter times, the celebrated Johanna Southcote; she announced herself as pregnant of the Messiah, and a whole swarm of English parsons were among her followers and believers! This doctrine, which Mr. Pope advocates, tends to the utter destruction of civil society and ecclesiastical regime I would rather endure the despotism of a Ferdinand, than admit a principle so contradictory to common sense—a principle so well calculated to rend asunder the ties which unite man to man. and to disolve the social system altogether

Mr. Pope.—My opponent, I must be allowed to observe, has substituted assertion for argument. He has said, that it is more difficult to prove the internal evidence of the scriptures, than their inspiration. I brought forward the internal evidence in proof of their inspiration. Mr. Maguire has asserted that a man must be baptized before he can receive the Holy Ghost. In the 8th chapter of the Acts of the Apostles, we read that Philip before he acceded to the wish of the Ethiopian eunuch, who requested to be baptized, said, "If thou believest with all thy heart, thou mayest;" the eunuch answered, "I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God." A man cannot exercise an act of faith, before he receives the Holy Ghost; for "no man

can say that Jesus is the Christ, but by the Holy Ghost." The eunuch, therefore, must have been under the influence of the Holy Spirit, when he made this act of faith. *After* he had made it, "they went down to the water, both Philip and the eunuch, and he baptized him." He says, that it is contrary to my system to urge any meaning of scripture against the conviction of the Socinian, as it would interfere with the exercise of his private judgment. I have already noticed his sophism, but the observation may properly be returned upon Mr. Maguire. Does not the church of Rome act in contradiction to her principles, when *arguing* with the Socinian? *Must* she not allow him to exercise his judgment upon the proofs which she brings forward in support of her claim to infallibility? My friend observes, that no man can force the judgment of another. I am convinced of the truth of the remark. But the church of Rome endeavours to force the judgment, and calls on men to act inconsistent with their reason? He says that I am opposed to the whole world. I stand here as an advocate of the great principles which genuine Protestants maintain in common, and as a protester against the errors to which they are in common opposed. Athanasius declared himself to be alone against the whole world, when Pope Liberius signed the Arian creed, and the condemnation of Athanasius.—(Dupin. Eccl. Hist. 2 vol. p. 62, 1697, Lond. —Baron. tom. 1, 939, ad ann. 357, No. 46, Mayence 1601.) My friend has stated that I brought forward corrupted passages of the fathers. Was it honorable in him to make such an assertion, particularly, when he will have an opportunity of consulting the quotations? I beg to say, that I have examined in the original with some care the passage from Augustin upon which my friend has so long dwelt; and I find that Augustin makes use of the expression "Catholicis *laudantibus* evangelium" *commending* the gospel—"vituperantibus Manichæum"—expressions which throw considerable light upon the passage. My learned opponent has asserted, that the Socinian never could be converted on my principles. The fact is otherwise; for Socinians have been converted by the advocates of private judgment. My friend has again repeated the position, that the children of Protestants must remain atheists until they arrive at the years of discretion. I beg altogether to deny the truth of the assertion. Much, I admit, devolves on parents and pastors. Their *authority* I recognize; but AUTHORITY IS ONE THING INFALLIBILITY ANOTHER. Is not a Roman Catholic child precisely in the same circumstances? I must be permitted to deny, that children always receive grace in baptism, and appeal to scripture in support of my opinion How does the Roman Catholic child receive the doctrines of his church, if not upon the

statement of the parent or the priest, a child being quite incapable of exercising its reason on the proofs of the infallibility of the church of Rome? In first of Corinthians, 12th chapter, there is a beautiful comparison. An analogy is there drawn between the church and the human body. The members of the human frame contribute mutually to each other's well-being:—

"The eye cannot say to the hand, I need not thy help; nor again the head to the feet, I have no need of you. Yea, much more, those that seem to be the more feeble members of the body, are necessary; and such as we think to be the less honorable members of the body, about these we put more abundant honour; and those that are our uncomely parts, have abundant comeliness. But our comely parts have no need; but God hath tempered the body together, giving to that which wanted the more abundant honour; that there might be no schism in the body, but the members might be mutually careful one for another. And if one member suffer any thing, all the members suffer with it; or if one member glory, all the members rejoice with it."—v. 21—26.

The poor believer, who is acquainted with a person of judgment and piety, may derive useful information from him; may receive his testimony; but in doing so, he does not acknowledge his infallibility. Thus, each member of the church of Christ, contributes to the edification of the whole body; but I deny that any part or the whole is infallible.

Mr. Maguire insinuates that a man cannot know whether he is enlightened by the Holy Spirit. The Apostle says,

"If any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his.—Rom. viii, 9. Again, "Try your ownselves, if ye be in the faith: prove ye yourselves: know you not your ownselves, that Christ Jesus is in you, unless perhaps you be reprobates?—2 Cor. xiii, 5.

Would the Apostle use such language, if it were not possible to discover whether we are influenced by the grace of God?

My friend has reminded us, that "Faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God." It is true that the reading of the scripture is not the only mean by which faith cometh, as history and experience testify. The kingdom of God is promoted by preaching also; but *preaching must be found to accord with the word of God,—otherwise there can be no saving faith produced.* It is the first time I heard that Beza was a translator of the Bible in the time of James I.

Mr. Maguire, as occasion requires, asserts, that the Bible supports the church, and *vice versa*, that the church the Bible. There is no departure from my principles in first exercising my judgment on the proofs of revelation, and subseqently appealing to revelation *in confirmation* of the right of private judgment.

Mr. Maguire says, that it would be a pity to deprive the poor man of his belief, that the Bible is the word of God, by telling him that his church is not infallible. I ask, are poor Protestants, who deny the infallibility of the church of Rome, as unac-

quainted with the contents of the revelation as the poor belonging to the church of Rome; or do they doubt the genuineness, and authenticity, and inspiration of the scriptures? Let experience and fact testify and answer these questions.

Faith, we are again told, cannot be divine, if it rests upon the testimony of man. On my principles, my faith rests not upon the testimony of man, but of God. Truth is revealed by God in the sacred volume, and I exercise faith upon that truth. My friend, on the contrary, would have us to exercise an act of faith in the infallibility of the church of Rome upon the authority of the scriptures, regarded merely as an historical narrative.

Mr. Maguire's quotations from Luther are probably of a similar description with the extract which a Roman Catholic Priest lately gave in a sermon, from the table-talk of Luther, that "Moses was a hangman." The German word, in more polished phraseology, signifies an "executioner;" and it is plain from the context, that by the word "Moses," Luther intended to designate *the Moral Law*, which acts as an executioner to those who *seek to be justified* by their obedience to its demands.

What was the conduct of the Apostles? Did they domineer over the faith of the primitive Christians?

"Not for that, says the Apostle Paul, we have dominion over your faith, but are helpers of your joy."—2 Cor. i, 23.

When the Bereans contrasted with the scriptures the preaching *even of an Apostle*, are they condemned for not having implicitly received his testimony? No, St. Luke, in the seventh chapter of Acts, and eleventh verse, writes,

"*Those were more noble* than those of Thessalonica, in that they received the word with all eagerness, *daily searching the scriptures whether these things were so.*"

Here we find the Bereans exercising their judgments on the Old Testament, in reference to the preaching of an inspired Apostle; and not only is there no censure passed upon them, but, on the other hand, a high eulogium pronounced upon their conduct. My friend has quoted the passage—"If an angel from heaven preach any other Gospel unto you than that which you have received, let him be accursed." Gal. i, 8, 9. Is not this a direct appeal to us to exercise our judgment upon the doctrines of a preacher, even though he should descend from heaven, irradiated with all the brightness of angelic glory? My friend's analogy between an appeal to the church of Rome and to Judges, to Parliament and to the house of Lords, falls to the ground; for neither Judges, nor Parliament, nor house of Lords are infallible. Judges can only take cognizance of the outward act, but the church of Rome would extend its control over the

mind and conscience. Judges must not be parties in the causes which come before them, lest they should be biased by interest. But the Pope, and his undefined church are a party in the honours and emoluments which result from their claim of infallibility. We perceive, therefore, that there exists no analogy. Mr. Maguire has quoted, as if from scripture, the words, "captivating the understanding." I do not remember such a text. My friend has stated, that the principle of private judgment has led to the deposing of monarchs. I have before remarked, that the principle should be exercised in accordance with sound sense. On the other hand, I shall prove that Popes considered themselves justified in deposing sovereigns. I would ask, was it the right of private judgment, or the pretension of infallibility, which led Gregory VII, to depose Henry, Emperor of Germany? Gregory's decree runs thus—

"On the part of the Omnipotent God, I forbid Henry to govern the kingdoms of Germany and Italy. I absolve all his subjects from every oath which they have taken or may take to him; and I excommunicate every person who shall serve him as king.—(Lib. v, Ep. 24.)

Gregory IX, made the following announcement in the thirteenth century—

"Be it known to all, who are under the dominion of heretics, that they are set free from every tie of fidelity or duty to them; all oaths, and solemn engagements to the contrary notwithstanding."—(Lib. v, Tit. 7.)

The Maynooth Class-book informs us, that—

"The Pope passed sentence against the Emperor Frederick upon a charge of having violated a treaty of peace, and also upon a vehement suspicion of heresy. The words of the sentence were these:—'Inasmuch as we, though unworthy, *do stand in the place of Jesus Christ on earth*, and to us it was said, in the person of the Apostle Peter, whatsoever thou bindest on earth shall be bound in heaven,' we having previously used diligent deliberation with our brethren and the holy council (the council of Lyons, received as general at Maynooth) concerning the above, and many other nefarious excesses, do declare the aforesaid prince to be bound in his sins, to be a cast-away, and deprived of all honour and dignity; we denounce him, and deprive him by this sentence, absolving his subjects from their oaths of fidelity, and by our apostolical authority, strictly enjoining, that no one shall hereafter obey him as emperor or king."

Here are examples of the head of the church, by the exercise of his authority, deposing kings; and in one of the instances adduced, asserting that the proceeding was sanctioned by a general council.

On the other hand, I assert, that whenever an individual in the exercise of his judgment has co-operated in deposing a sovereign, he has abused the faculty. I argue not for the abuses of private judgment. If I find the exercise of private judgment to accord with the voice of the God of Nature and of Revelation, I maintain that the charges of my opponent are

levelled not against me, but against the Lord of Lords and King of Kings. Is it logical to argue from the abuse of a thing against its use? Every blessing may be perverted. Learning, health, and liberty, may be abused; but are we, therefore, to prefer the iron grasp of tyranny to the sweets of freedom; and are ignorance and debility to be substituted in the room of science and of health? One word more—the doctrine of infallibility militates against the promises of divine wisdom made to them that seek it. The Psalmist says:

"Open thou mine eyes that I may behold wondrous things out of thy law."—cxix Ps. 18.

"Thy word is a lamp to my feet, and a light to my paths."—cxix Ps. 105.

"If ye then being evil," says the Saviour, "know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more will your heavenly Father give his Holy Spirit to them that ask him."—Luke, xi, 13.

"If any man lack wisdom," says St. James, "let him ask of God, who giveth to all men liberally, and upbraideth not, and it shall be given unto him."—i, 5.

If I am to bow implicitly to the dictates of the church of Rome, why do I want wisdom? Why should I exercise my judgment by "proving all things and holding fast that which is good?" Monstrous contradiction! In truth the very fact that God has vouchsafed to us a revelation of his will and character, evidently implies, that man should exercise his judgment upon its contents. I would say in conclusion, therefore, let us all, clergy as well as laity, vindicate the right of private judgment. The priests, as well as the laics, must answer at the bar of judgment. They cannot give account for us. Wo to those who follow the direction of ecclesiastics *implicitly*. It is written,

"The blind and the leaders of the blind shall both fall into the ditch."

I fear that quotations from the Fathers are calculated rather to weaken the impression, which I trust has been made upon your conscience. As, however, a few minutes remain, I shall occupy them by reading you a few extracts. St. Augustin says, that

"The manner of expression in which the holy scripture is framed, although it is to be penetrated but by few, is accessible to all. Those plain things which it contains, it speaks to the heart of the unlearned and learned, like a familiar friend, without disguise. That mind which is inimical to this doctrine, is either erroneously ignorant that it is most wholesome or loathes the medicine from disease."—*Epist.* 137 *ad Volusianum.*

Again, "God has bowed the scriptures even to the capacity of babes and sucklings, as he hath in another Psalm, he bowed the heavens and came down."

For the exposition of passages which cannot be explained by a comparison with other parts of the sacred volume, Augustin's rule is, not to consult an infallible church, but

"Let every one interpret according to his own sense."

"Prout quisque voluerit."—*Lib. de unit Ecc.* c. 16.

St. Chrysostom says,

"All necessary things are manifest."—*Hom. in 2 Thes. 2.*

St. Basil says,

"The hearers that are instructed in the scriptures must examine the doctrines of their teachers; they must receive those things which are agreeable to scripture, and reject what are contrary to it."—*In Moralium Regula 72, in initio.*

Mr. MAGUIRE—This, perhaps, is the most important half hour of the discussion. It remains for this assembly to say whether Mr. Pope has at all attempted to get out of the difficulty—to wit, how a Protestant child could make an act of faith upon the inspiration of the scriptures. All Mr. Pope's arguments went to show that the scriptures are the word of God. Is there an individual present who does not entertain a similar opinion? That belief is a common principle between us. I only want to show that the Protestant child cannot know the scriptures to be the word of God, by the rule which Mr. Pope endeavours to establish.—Mr. Pope places the child under circumstances which render it impossible for him to make an act of faith. Would it not be better for Mr. Pope to show how the Protestant child could make an act of faith, than to treat us to a sermon on the Bible, quoting St. Augustin as to its utility—a thing which I surely never denied. I trust in heaven I shall never forbid the reading of the holy Bible, under proper circumstances. St. Augustin speaks of the perusal of the sacred scriptures being useful to children; does he thereby constitute them as infallible authorities to decide upon its meaning? The man who recognizes an infallible authority, believes in articles of faith which he could otherwise never ascertain of himself whether they came from God, or were committed to writing by men inspired by him. I have shown that Christ left a sure and certain guide to direct mankind. If God had not appointed a guide to direct man, he would have left the mass of mankind involved in ignorance and error. If the Bible contain divine truths, of what utility would it be to the ignorant, if they possessed not the means of ascertaining whether it be the work of God? Mr. Pope has not shown how the ignorant can ascertain whether the Bible be the word of God. If the Bible *exclusively* contains the word of God, will Mr. Pope show us from the Bible, the procession of the Holy Ghost—baptism with the sign of the cross—consubstantiality—and that infants may be baptized contrary to the practice of Christ and his Apostles? I understand that Mr. Pope indeed is a dissenter from the church of England on those points. But that fact alone proves that there is no unity of doctrines amongst Protestants, and that

while the Bible teaches one Protestant to believe one thing, it teaches a second Protestant to believe another thing. There are many articles of faith admitted by Protestants, not to be found in the Bible. Will Mr. Pope show me from the Bible, an authority for changing the Sabbath? Mr. Pope said the Apostles broke bread on that day of the week. Why, the Apostles broke bread upon every day in the week. That was an extremely weak and foolish argument to introduce to justify such a change. It appears that Mr Pope imagined he had caught me in an historical error. He says I have quoted Beza as one of those who translated the Bible in the reign of James I. I deny the fact—I accused Luther, Beza, and others, of wilfully corrupting the Bible; but not the Bible as translated in James I's reign. Would Mr. Pope insinuate that there were no other translations prior to that time? Has he never heard of one by Luther—one by Zuinglius—one by Œcolampadius, &c, &c?

Latimer corrupted the text, and bid defiance to all authority—so did Cranmer, and Henry VIII,—he who, after leading a bad life, when his end approached, thought only of saving his soul, and accordingly returned to that church where certainty and truth were alone to be found. But Mr. Pope has given up Henry VIII, Luther, and Cranmer,—he scarcely defended Beza; and he ventured not to whisper a word in support of Zuinglius, who received his doctrine against transubstantiation from a spirit, as he says himself, nescio an albo, vel nigro.

Mr. Pope talks of a Catholic clergyman having misquoted Luther, in asserting that Luther called Moses a hangman. Mr. Pope says he only calls him an executioner. What is an executioner but a hangman? I deny that Mr. Pope interprets the German text correctly. I have the original work of Luther, in German, here on the table, and the celebrated Pichler says that the word employed by Luther does mean hangman.

As to Mr. Pope's arguments respecting the deposing power assumed by some pontiffs—I never said the Popes were infallible. Moreover, Christ did not combine the quality of impeccability with the prerogative of infallibility. Judas did not lose his faith when he betrayed his master—and Christ says to Peter,—

"But I have prayed for thee that thy faith fail not; and thou being once converted, confirm thy brethren."—(Luke, xxii, 32.)

Infallibility and impeccability are not then inseparable, as Mr. Pope would maintain. Out of nearly three hundred Popes, there are only eleven whose conduct and lives can be arraigned as absolutely criminal. Who is there here that has not committed sin? Let him who is spotless throw the first stone. We hear enough of "saints" in these days—but we know that our Saviour compared the Pharisees to white-washed sepulchres

It is easy enough to assume the appearance of sanctity, and to put on a puritanical face. I again ask Mr. Pope how the Protestant child can be led by internal evidence to make an act of faith, and that too upon the Bible, before he can know that it is the word of God? I repeat the question which I have already urged respecting the Socinian. Does not Mr. Pope violate the principle of private judgment when he endeavours to force his interpretation of the scriptures upon the Socinian? Has not the Socinian as good a right to attack the private judgment of Mr. Pope? If I could not convince the Socinian of the divinity of Christ by the authority of the church, I would not, at all events, go in direct opposition to my avowed and well known principles. I would force upon him the general agreement of nations which ascribes to Christ the establishment of a church, and of an infallible guide. As I said already, I would shame him into conviction, by appealing to the consent of nations, all differing from each other on other subjects, and yet agreeing in this point—I would prove that the *vox Populi* was here truly the *vox Dei*. I would show him the voice of God in the church, and that he was, therefore, called upon to obey. If I left him unconvinced I would enjoy this advantage over Mr. Pope, that he could not charge me with self-contradiction. But the difficulties which Mr. Pope would have to encounter with the Socinian are insuperable. The Socinian would say, that he could not conscientiously believe that a God could suffer death—he would not allow it, because he would say it was against reason. In vain would Mr. Pope adduce against him the evidence of the Bible. The Socinian would appeal to the grand charter of gospel liberty, the right of private judgment. If the Bible can be interpreted by private judgment, I should like to know from Mr. Pope, with the aid of his internal illumination, what is the meaning of that passage in Zacharias, where the prophet says, "upon one stone there are seven eyes." I should also like to know from him, why did God forbid fish to be offered by the Jews in sacrifice? And why did God command the Jews not to wear drugget? Can Mr. Pope interpret these difficult passages? Are there ten Protestants here who will give the same interpretation to any one text of scripture? Will it be said, that the Holy Ghost can infuse the spirit of contradiction. Every heretic may have recourse to this rule of private judgment, and by it justify his errors. It is good for society that obedience be rendered to human power—why not also to spiritual power? If a fallible authority is to be obeyed by man when he is not able to live by himself, a *fortiori*, he should yield obedience to an infallible authority in the great and important concern of his salvation. If temporal power be not established in society

neither order nor regularity will exist. A similar authority should exist in the spiritual society instituted by Christ. If it be a fact, that the church of Christ could teach error, then the more perfect dispensation of the Son of God, did not leave us any thing equal to the Jewish synagogue, which, until his coming, did not err in the faith. And yet Mr. Pope will have it, that the church of Christ has erred.

Mr. Pope will not yield his assent to that which is borne out by the general consent of many and different nations from the first era of Christianity. The principle which Mr. Pope advocates are those upon which Arius and Eutyches, Cerinthus, and all other heretics, ground their defence. They are the principles which inspired the wild men and women in Germany, who danced naked through the streets, shouting aloud that the kingdoms of the earth were given unto them, with an army of fifty thousand to make good their claims. These are instances, I will be told, of the abuse of private judgment, but they are abuses necessarily flowing from the principle itself. I would ask, when the principle is once granted, where is the guarantee against its abuse. Is it to be unlimited in its nature; or will Mr. Pope venture to draw out the line of demarcation? Or rather, will he not—must he not, to be at all consistent, allow every individual to do as he pleases?

Jesus Christ is the real high priest—the corner-stone of his church, and the Apostles and their successors are the superstructure, teaching and preaching, through the guidance of the Holy Ghost,

"And I will ask the Father (says our Saviour to his Apostles) and he shall give you another Paraclete, that he may abide with you for ever."—John, xiv, 16.

I shall again put the question (which I have so often repeated) in due form to Mr. Pope, and if he be a sincere lover of truth, I expect an answer from him in plain and obvious terms. I call upon him to point out in what manner a Protestant child, before he arrives at the years of discretion, can make an act of faith or how he can ascertain the authority of the scriptures? He must remain a doubter, and consequently an infidel. But the Catholic has but one single, solitary fact to establish, namely, the authority of the church; in arriving at that, he is at liberty to exercise his judgment, but when he has once ascertained the fact, he yields to the church unlimited obedience in matters of faith. But the Protestant possesses no such means to enable him to make an act of faith. All great writers have seen this difficulty. It was acknowledged by Claude in the celebrated discussion with Bossuet, and he endeavoured to throw it back on Bossuet, as Mr. Pope has attempted to do with me.

But I have shown that the Catholic can make the act of faith, after he has ascertained the simple fact of the church's authority. While the Protestant must ascertain that every single text of scripture is inspired, and that all are preserved pure and unchanged, as they were originally written by the Apostles. The Protestant must travel through this impracticable inquiry, therefore it is impossible that he can make an act of faith. While, on the contrary, the Catholic has simply to ascertain the authority of the church, and then to yield obedience to it. It was for that purpose Christ left us his church upon earth; and St. Peter says of the scriptures—

"In which there are some things hard to be understood, which the unlearned and unstable wrest, as also the other scriptures, to their own perdition."—(2 Peter, iii, 16.)

It is manifest, then, that there must exist an authority to direct us in the interpretation of the sacred volume.

I beg to conclude this day's discussion, by apologizing for the many disadvantages under which I labor. I am not able to engage your fancy by language shining and sparkling as a bottle of champaign. I possess not the powers of oratory to catch the feelings, and to lead captive the understandings of my auditory. If truth did not combat on my side, how is it possible that a man like me, who cannot boast of much learning—who has been for years engaged in the laborious duties of the mission, and totally estranged from the pursuits of literature, could meet and oppose, by sound arguments, the reasonings of a man like Mr. Pope, who has devoted his life to the study of this subject, and who has nothing else to occupy his attention.

THIRD DAY.—Saturday, April 21.

SUBJECT.—"*The Doctrine of Purgatory.*"

At eleven o'clock the chair was taken by Admiral OLIVER and JOHN O'BRIEN, Esq., of Elmvale.

Mr. POPE rose, and called on Mr. Maguire for his proofs of the doctrine of Purgatory.

Mr. MAGUIRE.—Gentlemen, I appear this day at the bar of public opinion, to defend a doctrine in which we are all equally concerned—that there do exist prejudices against that doctrine amongst many of my Protestant countrymen is too notorious

to be questioned. If I should be happy enough to remove any of them, it will be doing much for your salvation, and will afford me sincere pleasure. If this doctrine of purgatory be once removed,—if this most consolatory dogma be discarded,—you must then resort to the dreadful alternative of believing that the moment the soul is departed from the body, it is either plunged for eternity into the depths of hell, or borne triumphantly by the angels of God into the realms of endless bliss. Is there any person here so presumptuous as to say, that he expects with confidence, the moment of his dissolution to appear before a merciful but essentially just Judge, white as the snows of heaven, and pure as the angels of God? I wish any man who may possess it joy of such confidence—most assuredly it is not mine.

Before I proceed to my direct proofs of purgatory, (for I only deal in direct arguments) I may here remind you, though perhaps I am not strictly in order in so doing, that I proposed yesterday three arguments to my learned friend, at which, as appears to me, he has scarcely condescended to glance. I asked him what was the last resolution of an act of faith in the mind of a Protestant. I called upon him to explain to the satisfaction of the meeting, how a Protestant on taking the Bible into his hands, could make an act of divine faith upon the absolute inspiration of the sacred scriptures. I called upon him to show, by what means he could make any rational impression upon the mind of the Socinian, who admits the scriptures, and who also admits the right of private judgment in common with Mr. Pope. I wanted him to show how he would impress upon the mind of the Socinian, that fundamental doctrine of Christianity—the divinity of Jesus Christ. The moment Mr. Pope attempts to press his particular interpretation on the Socinian, the latter claims an equal right to choose his own interpretation of the text—he tells Mr. Pope, that he is violating the principle of private judgment, and that he should not monopolize and appropriate to himself, that which was every man's birth-right. He asserts, moreover, that his interpretation is more rational than that of Mr. Pope, who proposes a doctrine (he will say) opposed to human reason, and to common sense. When, therefore, Mr. Pope should propose to the Socinian, doctrines above human comprehension, he justly claims his own right of private judgment. he weighs all mysteries in the scale of human reason, and taxes Mr. Pope with a violation of his hereditary right.

I asked Mr. Pope, how he could, with the Bible in his hand, convert the benighted pagan? The latter in search of truth, takes up the scriptures, reads therein several passages, which, to a mind not endowed with spiritual light, may appear to sanction the most desperate crimes: he is beset on all sides by the

objections of deists and atheists—of Voltaire, Diderot, Rousseau, Julian the apostate, Celsus, Porphyry, &c. And if St. Augustin had to write four large volumes to reconcile the four evangelists, is it not plain that the half-converted infidel must have recourse to the authority of the church, to solve all his difficulties, and remove his doubts? or, if he would not trust to that authority, he must be able to explain away all the objections of the deists—to compare and examine every passage in the Bible; he must prove the authenticity, the integrity and the inspiration of the scriptures,—and here is a task, which I humbly conceive Mr. Pope himself is not adequate to perform. These are the three points which I have repeatedly urged upon the attention of Mr. Pope, and which he has not met to the satisfaction of this meeting.

I now come to my direct proofs of Purgatory. I shall first state what is the doctrine of the Catholic church on the subject. According to the Roman Catholic faith, we believe that after the Almighty God has forgiven the sins actually committed by man, as to the *eternal punishment* a *temporal* punishment may be annexed by God as the effect of sin, and may remain after the eternal punishment has been remitted. This temporal penalty may be inflicted in this life, or may be inflicted in the next. Thus, after the fall of Adam, though his sin was washed out by faith in a future Saviour's blood, still death remained as the temporal punishment and consequence of the original sin of Adam.

When David was guilty of the double crime of adultery and murder, and when the prophet Nathan announced to him, upon the authority of God himself, that his crimes were forgiven by the Lord of Hosts, he at the same time annexed to the forgiveness of the eternal penalty a temporal punishment, for he declared to David that his adulterous offspring should not live. David wept bitterly—he bedewed the sheets of his bed with tears, and he besought the Lord that his child might live; but the child died, and this was a temporal punishment annexed to the sin, after the eternal had been forgiven. Catholics do not hold that there is any particular fire in purgatory. The church has not taken upon herself to determine where purgatory exists;—all she has defined in the council of Trent, which is very explicit on the subject, is, to pronounce it an article of faith, that there exists a third place, where the soul of some go after death, and where they are detained by Almighty God, till they are purified and prepared for heaven. That, after a certain detention there, through the mercy of God, and the prayers and suffrages of the faithful on earth, they are received into heaven. This is a plain dogma. It has nothing to do with racks, tortures, or fires, or many other things with which, no doubt, in the minds of some

present, the doctrine of purgatory has been heretofore associated. It now remains with you to see what are the proofs of purgatory and what the motives of credibility which induce Catholics to believe in that doctrine. The first text I shall quote to you is from St. Matthew, ch. v, ver. 25, 26.

"Make an agreement with thy adversary quickly, whilst thou art in the way with him; lest perhaps the adversary deliver thee to the judge, and the judge deliver thee to the officer, and thou be cast into prison. Amen, I say to thee, thou shalt not go out from thence, till thou pay the last farthing."

It is very clear that the words here "whilst thou art in the way," mean whilst in this life; and that the expression which follows, "lest thy adversary deliver thee to the judge, and the judge to the officer, and thou be cast into prison," from whence there is no release till the last farthing shall be paid, means, lest thou shalt be overtaken by death, who comes like a thief in the night, and be cast into purgatory, where the last farthing shall be paid—that is, all your sins must be expiated by suffering, before you shall be released, and admitted into the regions of bliss. I pretend not to give a particular description of the place to which the sacred text alludes, but I leave the passage to make its due impression upon the mind of every honorable Protestant. The next passage I shall cite is from St. Matthew, ch. xii, ver. 32, 36.

"And whosoever shall speak a word against the Son of man, it shall be forgiven him; but he that shall speak against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him, either in this world, or in the world to come. But I say unto you, that every idle word that men shall speak, they shall render an account for it in the day of judgment."

Here our Saviour makes the utterance of a single idle word a sin to be accounted for at the day of judgment. Is the supposition violent that a man may suddenly expire after the expression of an idle word. That idle word does not constitute a mortal sin sufficient to damn him for ever; it is that species of sin to which the prophet alludes when he says, that the just man falls seven times a-day. He could not be a just man if these were mortal sins. If then a man be suddenly carried off in an apoplectic fit, and cannot enter heaven on account of the utterance of a single word, where does he go? I beg leave to refer you to the 1st Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians, iii, 8, 12, 13, 14, 15.

"Now he who planteth, and he who watereth are one. And every one shall receive reward according to his own labour. Now if any man build upon this foundation, gold, silver, precious stones, wood, hay, stubble; every man's work shall be made manifest; for the day of the Lord shall declare it because it shall be revealed by fire; and the fire shall try every man's work of what sort it is. If any man's work abide which he hath built thereupon; he shall receive a reward. If any man's work burn he shall suffer loss; but he himself shall be saved, yet so as by fire."

I may here remark, what I shall prove—that of seventeen

holy fathers of the 2d, 3d, 4th, and 5th centuries, from whose works I shall hereafter give you ample quotations, there is not one, with the exception of two, that does not refer to the foregoing text in proof of the existence of purgatory. I shall only say that if any passages shall be adduced from scripture, against purgatory clearer than this text, which is manifestly in support of that doctrine, I will then acknowledge that I am wrong. I shall next refer you to 2d Corinthians, i, 11.

"You," St. Paul says, "helping withal in prayer for us; that for this gift obtained for us by many persons thanks may be given by many in our behalf."

St. Paul here begs the prayers of the Corinthians—these prayers, it is true, were for the living—and *I therefore am not for contending that this text is a clear one in favor of purgatory.* But if prayers for the living be justifiable and proper, I cannot undersand why prayers for the dead should be condemned. Again, 1st Peter, iii, 18, 19, 20.

"Because Christ also died once for our sins, the just for the unjust, that he might offer us to God, being put to death indeed in the flesh, but brought to life by the spirit. In which also he came and preached to those spirits who were in prison; who in time past had been incredulous when they waited for the patience of God in the days of Noe, when the ark was a building; in which few, that is eight souls, were saved by water.

Here we find a prison spoken of, into which Christ entered and preached to the dead. Here is a manifest acknowledgment of a third place. The creed says, that Christ descended into hell—surely not into the hell of the damned—for it is recorded, that Christ released those who were detained therein. *Will it be shown that the place referred to in this text, and into which Christ entered has ceased to exist?*

Our Saviour says, Matt. xii, 32,

"And whosoever shall speak a word against the Son of man, it shall be forgiven him; but he that shall speak against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world nor in the world to come."

Now as St. Augustin justly remarks, in commenting on this passage, if no sin can be forgiven in the world to come, the argument of Christ has lost its force; and as in that case it would be equally impossible to obtain forgiveness in the world to come for sins against the Father and the Son, as for those against the Holy Ghost, the passage would mean nothing. I shall add to the quotations which I have already given, the following from the 2d book of Maccabees, xii, 43 We find it there recorded, that Judas Maccabeus

"Making a gathering, he sent twelve thousand drachms of silver to Jerusalem for sacrifice, to be offered for the sins of the dead, thinking well and religiously concerning the resurrection."

And it is added, "It is therefore a holy and wholesome thought to pray for the dead, that they may be loosed from their sins."

I am well aware that we shall hear arguments urged against the canonicity of this book. But I shall only use it as an *historical testimony* for the present; and as such it proves, that Judas Maccabeus offered up prayers for the dead, "deeming it a holy and wholesome thought to pray for the dead, that they may be loosed from their sins."

As an historical record, it testifies that the practice of praying for the dead existed among the Jews. When Christ condemned the fables and inventions of the Pharisees, why did he not point his indignant censure against this practice, and condemn this portion of the public worship of the Jews as superstitious, or unjustifiable? I would wish much that Mr. Pope would adhere to strict argument and logical deduction. It will be in vain for him to meet direct arguments, drawn from Scripture, and from the practice of the church during the first five hundred years of the Christian æra, by an *historical quibble.* Such a subterfuge exposes the weakness of his arguments.

I shall now proceed to lay before you various quotations from the fathers on the present subject, and I pledge myself to their accuracy and authenticity. Tertullian says, De Corona Militum, p. 209,

"Among the Apostolical traditions received from our fathers, we have oblations for the dead on the anniversary day—oblationes pro defunctis annua die facimus."

In his treaties on Monogamy, cap. x, p. 555, he thus advises a widow—

"Pray for the soul of your departed husband, entreating repose to him and participation in the first resurrection—making oblations for him on the anniversaries of his death, which, if you neglect, it may be truly said of you, that, as far as in you lies, you have repudiated your husband."

And addressing widowers, he says, exhortatio ad castitatem, cap. ix,

"Reflect for whose soul you pray—for whom you make annual oblations. Pro cujus spiritu postules—pro qua oblationes annuas reddas."

The holy Father and Martyr, Cyprian, who lived in the 2d century, says,

"Our predecessors prudently advised, that no brother departing this life should nominate any churchman his executor; and should he do it, that no oblation should be made for him, nor sacrince offered for his repose—of which we have had a late example, when no oblation was made, nor prayer in his name offered in the church."—Epist. i, p. 2.

And again—"It is one thing to be a petitioner for pardon, and another to arrive at glory; one to be cast into prison and not to go out from thence till the last farthing be paid, and another to receive at once the reward of faith and virtue; one, in punishment of sin, to be purified by long suffering, and purged long by fire—and another to have expiated all sins by (previous) suffering; one, in fine, at the day of judgment, to wait the sentence of the Lord; another to receive an immediate crown from him."—Epist. cv, p. 109

Origen (Homily 6. in Exod. tome ii. p. 148), says,

"He that is saved is saved by fire; so that if he has in him any thing of the nature of lead that the fire may purge, and reduce it till the mass become pure gold. Qui salvus fit per ignem salvus fit ut id ignis decoquat, et resolvat For the gold of that land which the saints are to inhabit is said to be pure, and as 'the furnace trieth gold, so doth temptatation try the just.'—Eccles. 27. We must then all come to this proof, 'for the Lord sits as a refiner, (Mal. iii, 3,) and he shall purify the sons of Levi.' But when we shall arrive at that place, who shall bring many good works, and little that is evil; this evil the fire shall purify as it does lead, and the whole shall become pure gold. He that takes with him more of lead, suffers the fire more, that he may be refined, and what little there is of gold, after the purification, remains. But should the whole mass be lead, that man must experience what is written: 'the sea covered them; they sank as lead in the mighty waters.'—Exod. xv, 10. Sin in its nature is like to that matter which fire consumes, and which the Apostle says is built up by sinners, who upon the foundation of Christ build wood, hay, and stubble.'—1 Cor. iii, 12. Which words manifestly show, that there are some sins so light as to be compared to stubble; to which, when fire is set it cannot dwell long—cui utique ignis illatus diu non potest immorari; that there are others like to hay, which the fire easily consumes, but a little more slowly than it does stubble; and others resemble wood, in which, according to the degree of criminality, the fire finds an abundant substance on which to feed. Thus each crime, in proportion to its character, experiences a just degree of punishment.

"When we depart this life, if we take with us virtues or vices, shall we receive rewards for our virtues, and those trespasses be forgiven to us which we knowingly committed; or shall we be punished for our faults and not receive the rewards of our virtues? Neither is true: because we shall suffer for our sins, and receive the rewards of our good actions. For if on the foundation of Christ you shall have built not only gold and silver, and precious stones, but also wood, and hay, and stubble, what do you expect, when the same shall be separated from the body? Would you enter into heaven with your wood, and hay, and stubble, to defile the kingdom of God; or, on account of those incumbrances, receive no reward for your gold and silver, and precious stones? Neither is this just. It remains, then, that you be committed to the fire, which shall consume the light materials; for our God, to those who can comprehend heavenly things, is called a *consuming* fire. But this fire consumes not the creature, but what the creature has himself built—wood, and hay, and stubble. First, therefore, we suffer on account of our transgressions, and then we receive our reward."—Homily, xvi, in Jerome, tom. iii.

I have here thirty-five quotations from Origen, all to the same effect, and in every one of which he alludes to the text of St. Paul relative to the hay, wood, and stubble, and the consequent purgation by fire.

Eusebius of Cæsarea, who belonged to the Greek church, describing the funeral of the emperor Constantine the Great, thus writes—

"In this manner did Constantius perform the last duties in honour of his father. But when he had departed with his guards, the ministers of God, surrounded by the multitude of the faithful, advanced into the middle space, and with prayers performed the ceremonies of divine worship: the blessed prince, reposing in his coffin, was extolled with many praises; when the people in concert with the priests, not without sighs and tears, offered prayers to heaven for his soul; in this manifesting the most acceptable service to a

religious prince. God thus gave him a place near the bodies of the holy Apostles, in order that he may enjoy their blessed fellowship, and in their temple be associated with the people of God. He would thus also be admitted to a participation in the religious rites, the mystic sacrifice, and holy suffrages of the faithful."—De Vita Constant. Lib. xi.

Arnobius, the master of Lactantius, and rhetorician at Sicca, in Numidia, who lived about the end of the 3rd century, thus writes:

"Why were the oratories (of the Christians) destined to savage destruction wherein prayers are offered up to the sovereign God; peace and pardon are implored for all men, magistrates, soldiers, kings, friends, and enemies, FOR THOSE WHO ARE ALIVE, AND FOR THOSE WHO HAVE QUITTED THEIR BODIES?'

St. Basil

"The words of Isaiah, 'Through the wrath of the Lord is the land burned, (ix, 19,) declare, that things which are earthly shall be made the food of a punishing fire to the end, that the same may receive favour and be benefitted.' 'And the people shall be as fuel of the fire.'—(Ibid.) This is not a threat of extermination, but it denotes *expurgation*, according to the expression of the apostle; 'If any man's works burn, he shall suffer loss; but he himself shall be saved, yet so as by fire.'—(1 Cor. iii, 15.)—Com. cap. ix, Isaiah, Tome i, p. 554.

"'And the light of Israel shall be for a fire.'—(Isaiah x, 17.) The operative powers of fire are chiefly two—it enlightens and it burns. The first is cheerful and pleasant—the second bitter and afflicting. The prophet adds, 'and he shall sanctify him in a holy fire, and consume the glory of his forest as grass.' He here shows the nature of the fire—it enlightens and purifies. But how does this fire purify, if it consumes? Truly, since our God is called 'a consuming fire,' he will consume the wood, and what vices arise from matter which adheres to the soul in the flesh, not in the spirit. And when the fire shall have consumed all the wood of sin, as it does grass, then that matter being destroyed, which was fuel to the chastising fire, the prophet says, 'The burnt mountains shall repose, and the hills, and the thick forests, and the consuming fire shall cease that fed upon them.'"—Ibid. p. 563.

I do not envy Mr. Pope, if he deem his private judgment superior to the texts which I have quoted, and to the judgment of the holy Fathers for five hundred years. I defy him to answer the following syllogistic argument:—Either the Fathers, at the period when they wrote, published that which was the established belief of the Catholic church, or they did not? If they did publish what was the doctrine in their time, then such doctrine must have been true, since the church is acknowledged on all hands to have been pure in the primitive ages of Christianity? If the Fathers published that which was not the established doctrine of the church, why did not the pure church protest, and not sanction error by her silence; and why did not the heretics protest, against whom those doctrines were advanced?

Mr. POPE rose and said,—My learned adversary commenced his observations by addressing himself to our fears. He spoke of the dreadful idea of being hurried instantaneously, either into the presence of Infinite Holiness, or into the regions of eternal woe. In order to alleviate those fears, he proposes to us the fire of

purgatory; of that purgatory, in which the church of Rome tells us, that some souls have been confined for more than a thousand years. My friend has adverted to the questions which he proposed yesterday. As my answers are already before the public who can decide whether they are satisfactory, I shall not follow Mr. Maguire through his devious ramblings. I shall merely observe, that he has this morning brought forward several arguments, *in addition to those* which he advanced yesterday, employed by infidels in their denial of the inspiration of the sacred scriptures. How did Mr. Maguire act yesterday? Instead of coming in a manly manner to the real question, he confined me to an extreme case. He asked me, by what mode I could convince an ignorant man that the Bible is the word of God? In reply, I enquired by what arguments he could convince him. You have heard the answers of both. I remarked, that in demonstrating to the illiterate man, that the scriptures were divine, I would appeal only to *the internal evidence*, which commends itself to the conscience, as having the impress of divine truth engraven upon it. I again ask, did not Mr. Maguire as well as myself appeal to the private judgment of the individual? Mr. Maguire would refer to the universal consent of mankind! I would ask, must not the ignorant man, in order to decide whether this universal consent exists in support of the sacred volume, must he not wade through the many tomes of the Fathers? I, therefore, again submit, upon whose part the greater difficulty exists, in convincing the illiterate person that the Bible is divine? In order to show, that, while the eternal punishment of sin is forgiven, its temporal punishment may remain, my friend has referred us to the cases of Adam and David. I readily admit, that while the Lord forgives the sins of his people, he frequently chastens them *in this life*, when they act inconsistently with their profession, and cause the adversary to blaspheme. The Lord says,

"When my people forsake my law, I will visit their transgressions with a rod, nevertheless my loving-kindness will I not utterly take from him, nor suffer my faithfulness to fail.—Psalm lxxxix, 30, 33.

"The lord chastens those whom he loves and scourges every son whom he receives."—Heb. xii, 6.

But I would ask, because God, in his infinite wisdom sees fit, when his people depart from him, to visit them with trials *in this life*, does this fact furnish any reason for supposing, that the Deity will extend that punishment *into another world?* By no means; there is not the slightest ground in scripture for an opinion, altogether so unworthy of the character of God. My friend observes, that the church of Rome has not defined the nature of the fire of purgatory. Cardinal Bellarmine, however, states, that the damned, and the souls in purgatory are tormented

in the same fire, and yet Mr. Maguire has informed us, that the doctrine of purgatory is a most comfortable doctrine!! The Reverend Gentleman has quoted the fifth of Matthew and 26th verse. It certainly appears to me strange, that a doctrine of such importance should, in the very first instance be made to rest upon a parable, the very explanation of which, as given by M. Maguire himself proves that it is parabolic. I shall now examine it, and set before you its true meaning. The passage runs thus,

"Make an agreement with thy adversary quickly, whilst thou art in the way with him, lest perhaps the adversary deliver thee to the judge, and the judge deliver thee to the officer, and thou be cast into prison. Amen, I say unto thee, thou shalt not go out from thence, till thou pay the last farthing."

I argue thus; if the uttermost farthing be *paid*, then are the sins of the individual not *pardoned;* for where the uttermost farthing is paid, there can be no pardon wanting; and on the contrary, if the sins are *pardoned*, then is the uttermost farthing not *paid.*

My friend talks of the honesty of his views and intentions, and of his candour in giving his opinions I trust, that I can appeal with equal confidence to the integrity of *my* conduct. My view of the passage before us is, that the punishment, of which our Saviour speaks, is eternal in its duration. The Redeemer appears desirous of showing in the parable, that there can be no hope of escape from that place, which he designates "prison," to that individual who dies in the rejection of the gospel. Several considerations are fitted to show us, that the punishment of which the Saviour speaks, is everlasting. The glory of God is infinite; our debt, if not remitted, infinite; the sinfulness of sin, infinite. Even according to the standard of this world, an offence is considered to rise in magnitude, in proportion to the dignity of the individual against whom it is committed; a libel upon the character of a private person, is treason when committed against a sovereign. The God against whom we have rebelled, is King of Kings, and Lord of Lords; our sins, therefore, being committed against infinite Majesty, unless blotted out in the atoning blood of Jesus, must for ever remain against us, and call down an interminable retribution. I shall quote a passage from a note in the Douay Bible, which fully justifies the view that I have taken of the expression, "*until* thou hast paid," *which implies that it shall never be paid.* The comment is on Matt. i, 25.

"'Till she brought forth her first-born son.'—From these words, Helvidius and others heretics most impiously inferred, that the blessed Virgin Mary had other children besides Christ. But St. Jerome shows, by divers examples, that this expression of the Evangelist was a manner of speaking usual among the Hebrews, to denote by the word *until, only what is done, without any regard to the future;* Thus, it is said, Gen. viii, 6, 7, That *Noah sent forth a raven which went forth, and did not return,* UNTIL *the waters were dried upon*

the earth; that is, did not return any more. Also, in Isaiah, xlvi, 4, God says, '*I am till you grow old.*' Who dare infer, that God should then cease to be? Also, in the first book of Maccabees, verse 54: '*And they went up to Mount Sion, with joy and gladness, and offered holocausts, because not one of them was slain, till they had returned in peace.*' That is, not one was slain before or after they had returned. God saith to his divine Son, '*Sit on my right hand,* TILL *I make thy enemies thy fotstool.*' Shall he sit no longer after his enemies are subdued? Yea, and for all eternity!!"

Mr. Maguire referred to the passage in Matt. xii, 32.

"Whosoever shall speak a word against the Son of Man, it shall be forgiven him; but he that shall speak against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, nor in the world to come."

Now, I beg to observe, that the phrase, "this world," and "the world to come," was current among the Jews, and denoted time in general. The Redeemer, I maintain, signified thereby, that the sin should never be forgiven. We should compare scripture with scripture, spiritual things with spiritual things, one passage with another. Thus in Mark iii, 29, and Luke xii, 10, we find the correspondent passages thus expressed:

"But he that shall blaspheme against the Holy Ghost, shall *never* have forgiveness, but shall be guilty of an everlasting sin. And whosoever speaketh a word against the Son of Man, it shall be forgiven him; but to him that shall blaspheme against the Holy Ghost, it shall *not* be forgiven."

The Jews expected under the Messiah a fuller dispensation of pardon than under the Mosaic economy. Our Lord here informs them of a sin, which, even under the privileges of the Christian dispensations, (see Heb. x, 28, 29,) is evidently, according to the text, unpardonable. The church of Rome has made an unhappy distinction between the greatness of one sin and another in the sight of God. It should be remembered, that "he who offendeth in one point," is stated by St. James, "to be guilty of all."—xi, 10.

Mr. Maguire has observed, that nothing unclean entereth into the kingdom of heaven. Granted; but I maintain, that the true purgatory is the fountain which has been opened for sin and for uncleanness, in the atoning blood of Jesus. My opponent has referred to the third chapter of the first Corinthians. We can without difficulty prove, that this passage does not support purgatory. When it is said, that "the fire shall *try* every man's work;" it is manifest that the fire is *probatory*, and not *purgatorial*. There is not a being in existence who does not commit those sins, for which, according to Mr. Maguire, men must go through the fire of purgatory. Again—it is said,

"*Every* man's work shall be made manifest of what sort it is."

Whence it is evident, that the works of the good and of the evil alike must endure the trying process. Does not this fact show that the fire is a fire of trial, not of purgation.

Further—it is the *work*, the *doctrine* of the individual, which is to be tried in this fire, and not his soul. The minister of the gospel is not to add to its fundamental truths, but to preach it in all its native simplicity; while the man who corrupts it with false philosophy, and builds upon it wood, hay, stubble, *if he holds the head Christ Jesus*, will be saved, yet so as by fire; that is, with extreme difficulty.

My friend referred to the first of Peter, iii, 19, 20.

"Christ also died once for our sins, the just for the unjust, that he might offer us to God, being put to death indeed in the flesh, but enlivened in the spirit, in which also coming, he preached to those spirits which had been some time incredulous, when they awaited for the patience of God, in the days of Noe, when the ark was building, wherein a few, that is eight souls, were saved by water."—Douay Bible.

Mr. Maguire is aware, that according to the church of Rome, *only* two descriptions of persons go to purgatory; those who die in venial sins, or those who die absolved from the guilt of mortal sin. In Roman Catholic catechisms, mortal sins are enumerated. The character of those persons who perished in the flood, as described in the book of Genesis, proves that they died in mortal sin:

"God seeing that the wickedness of men was great on the earth, and that all the thoughts of their hearts were bent upon evil at all times, it repented him that he had made man on the earth."—vi, 5.

Again:—"The earth was corrupted before God, and was filled with iniquity, and when God had seen that the earth was corrupted, for all flesh had corrupted its way upon the earth, he said to Noe, 'The end of all flesh is come before me; the earth is filled with iniquity through them, and I will destroy them with the earth.'"—11, 12, 13, and 14 verses.

My opponent cannot say that they received absolution; they despised Noah, a preacher of righteousness, and were overwhelmed in the flood, the guilt of mortal sin being fixed upon their heads.

Mr. Maguire says, Christ went and released those people out of prison. Look to the text. Did we even suppose that the passage referred to purgatory; it is merely said, that He *preached* to the spirits, but there is no mention whatsoever made of their having been delivered. My view of the passage is this: Christ was raised from the dead by the power of the Holy Ghost, in which spirit he preached to the Antediluvians; to the spirits *εν φολακι* "in prison;" (not *which were* in prison, as the Douay Bible renders the expression,) either in the spiritual prison of ungodliness, when Noah preached, or else in the prison of hell, when Peter wrote. Christ, through the instrumentality of Noah, preached before the flood. The Holy Spirit, though not so abundantly vouchsafed till the Christian dispensation, was always with the church of God. The view of the passage entertained by an authority which Mr. Maguire respects, coincides with mine

The venerable Bede, who lived more than one thousand years ago, gives us the opinion of an early Father, perhaps Athanasius, on this portion of scripture.

"He who in our times, coming in the flesh, preached the way of life to the world, even He himself also came before the flood, and preached to them who were then unbelieving, and lived carnally; for even he, by his Holy Spirit, was in Noah, and in the rest of the holy men which were at that time, and by their good conversation preached to the wicked men of that age, that they might be converted to better manners."—Ful. in Loco. sec. ii, p. 806.

My friend refers to the second of Maccabees twelfth chapter. I have already shown that this book is not canonical. I shall again refer to the fourteenth chapter, 41st and 42d, verse in which it will be seen, that suicide is commended.

"Now, as the multitude sought to rush into the house, and to break open the door, and set fire to it, when he was ready to be taken, he *struck himself with his sword*, choosing *to die nobly*, rather than to fall into the hands of the wicked."

Is the eulogy of such conduct in consistency with the spirit and precepts of the word of God? Consult another of the Apocryphal books, and you will find one Apocryphal book contradicting another. In the third chapter of Wisdom 1st to 4th verses, we read,—

"But the souls of the just are in the hands of God, and the torment of death shall not touch them; and their departure was taken for misery, and their going away from us for utter destruction; but they *die in peace*. And though in the sight of men they suffered torments, their hope is full of immortality."

Would the writer of the book of Wisdom have intimated, that their death was *falsely* taken for misery, if they must first pass through the torments of a purgatory? Would he have said, that *they are in peace?* Here is Wisdom against the second book of Maccabees. I would ask, did the individuals mentioned in the twelfth of Maccabees, for whom prayers were made, die in mortal sin? I hope that my friend allows, that idolatry is a mortal sin; they were guilty of it.

"They found under the coats of the slain, some of the donaries of the idols of Jamnia, which the law forbiddeth to the Jews, so that all plainly saw, that for this cause they were slain."—40.

Thus, regarding the Apocrypha, merely as an historical relation, and meeting my learned antagonist on this ground, as they contain palpable contradictions, why should they be made the foundation for even an historical truth. I must, however, advert to other matters. I am ready to prove the genuineness, authenticity, and canonicity of the scriptures, if the question be proposed to me in a manner becoming a scholar; but I have been shut up, as is evident, to an extreme case, that of the poor ignorant peasant. My friend has quoted largely from the

Fathers. I beg to remark, that M. Trevern, lately promoted from the bishopric of Aire to that of Strasburgh, (I need not add, a Roman Catholic divine) honestly admits, that Jesus Christ has communicated no revelation to us concerning purgatory, and observes—

"Had it been necessary for us to be instructed in such questions, Jesus would doubtless reveal the knowledge of them; HE HAS NOT DONE SO; we can, therefore, only form conjectures on the subject, more or less probable."—Discuss. Amic. Vol. ii, p. 242.

The celebrated Roman Catholic Bishop Fisher inform us, that—

"In the ancient Fathers, there is either none at all, or very rare mention of a purgatory: that by the Grecians it is not believed to this day: that the Latins, not all at once, but by little and little, received it, "pedetentim," step by step; and that *purgatory being so lately known*, it is not to be marvelled that in the first times of the church there was *no use of Indulgences*, seeing these had their beginning, *after that men for a while had been affrighted with the torments of purgatory.*"—Roffens Assert. Lutheran Confutat. Artic. 18.

Cardinal Cajetan observes—

"If we could have any certainty concerning the origin of indulgences, it would help us much in the disquisition of the truth of purgatory; but WE HAVE NOT BY WRITING ANY AUTHORITY, EITHER OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURES, OR ANCIENT DOCTORS, CREEK OR LATIN, WHICH AFFORDS US ANY KNOWLEDGE THEREOF."—Cap. 2, de Indulg.

And Alphonsus de Castro writes,

"*Many things* are known to us, of which the *ancients* were altogether ignorant, as *purgatory, indulgences*," &c,—Adv. Hœor. L. 12, Tit. Purg. f. 250.

We have Cyprian, Tertullian, and various other quotations from the Fathers, overturning those which have been adduced by my friend, did time permit me to repeat them. But I would briefly ask, why did Polycarp specially treat on the resurrection of the dead, and yet wholly omit the doctrine of purgatory? (Epist. ad Philip. § 11, v, ii.) Why did Ignatius assert, that only two states in the future world, a state of death, and a state of life, are set before us; so that every one who dies, goes to his own proper place; and why did he not make the slightest allusion to a purgatory, if he believed in it?—(Ep. ad Magnes. § v.) Why did Athenagaras write a treatise on the Resurrection of the Dead, and yet make no mention of purgatory?—De Resurr. Mort. in Oper. pp. 143—219. Cyprian says—

"When once we have departed hence, there is no longer any place for repentance—no longer *any effectiveness of satisfaction.* Here life is either lost or held; here we may provide for our eternal salvation by the worship of God and the fruitfulness of faith. Let not any one be retarded, either by sins or by length of years, from attaining to salvation. * * * * * To him who believes, a salutary indulgence is granted from the Divine pity; and *immediately after death he passes to a blessed immortality.*"—Cyprian ad Demetrian, p. 196.

Tertullian counts it injurious to Christ to hold that such as are called home by him, are in a state to *be pitied*. He says,—

"We wrong Christ, when we do not with equanimity hear of those who are summoned hence by him, as if they were to be pitied."—Lib. de Patient. c. 9

Mr. MAGUIRE.—You will easily perceive, gentlemen, that this is an important discussion. My adversary has endeavoured to explain away some of the texts—I shall only remark, that with regard to these texts, he may have his private judgment, and I have mine. There are two or three which we never shall give up—in respect to the others, we shall not relinquish the doctrine of the church for the first ages, and adopt the opinion of Mr. Pope. He says, that a man will be detained in purgatory for one thousand years—that is not the doctrine of the Catholic church, and I never said it was—it is absurd in this manner to meet direct arguments by unfounded suppositions. The church has pronounced no decision as to the length of time that souls may be detained in purgatory. If a soul remain there but for two minutes, the doctrine is as fully established, as if it remained there for two thousand years. My arguments are founded upon scripture and reason, and upon the authority of the universal church.

Mr. Pope has asserted, that a Roman Catholic, in making an act of faith, builds it upon private judgment.—The Catholic has only to exercise his private judgment upon the scriptural proofs of the authority of the church. That once established, the Catholic is enabled to make an act of faith upon Divine authority —the Protestant never can make an act of faith until he clears up all the sophistries and cavillings of the deists. The Catholic once admitting the authority of the church, rests satisfied—he laughs to scorn the objections of the infidel, and founds his faith upon the immoveable word of Christ. We exercise our private judgment to ascertain the authority of the church. But the moment we have that fact satisfactorily established, all our doubts and difficulties vanish. Mr. Pope then, all this while has been building castles in the air, and conjuring up the phantoms of his own imagination, for the mere purpose of laying them again. Similar arguments, to those which he has advanced, were urged by Porphyry, and Julian the apostate—by Rousseau, Diderot, and Voltaire, who set their own private judgments against the authority of the Catholic church, and some of whom, on their death-beds, sought to be reconciled to her communion. Mr. Pope has enlarged upon the wonderful blessing of being justified through the merits of Christ. I trust, that I am a Christian from conviction, and although the profession of it is not as frequently on my lips as on those of others, I hope to be justified through

the merits of Christ. I allow no merits but his. He is the source and fountain of all merit. That is the doctrine of the Catholic Church, and it is a point of our doctrine, regarding which Protestants are much misinformed. We do admit, that the saints can beseech Christ, and interfere by their prayers in our behalf—but we deny that they have any merits of their own —they have none, except through the Redeemer. Jesus Christ — he is the Divinity—the spring—the source whence every thing must come. It was through his infinite merits he saved the world.

Does Mr. Pope, in the hearing of bishops, dare to stay the arm of divine and omnipotent mercy, in his explanation of the sin against the Holy Ghost? Are we not told, that whoever invokes the name of the Lord shall be saved? Is it impossible that a man who has committed the sin against the Holy Ghost, who has denied the known truth, may not, after the revolution of sixty years, suppose, repent sincerely of his sins, obtain the pardon of a merciful God, and be saved? Shall it be said, that the gates of heaven would be closed against a truly repentant sinner? Tertullian was condemned for asserting, that the church had not the power to absolve from the sin of apostacy, and from the sin against the Holy Ghost. Tertullian was excluded from the Catholic church in the second century, because he promulgated such a doctrine. Mr. Pope says, that by paying the last farthing, is meant paying in this world.

[Mr. Pope.—What I stated was, that if sins be *forgiven* in purgatory, the uttermost farthing cannot be *paid* there—if the uttermost farthing be *paid*, sins cannot be *forgiven* in purgatory.]

Mr. Maguire.—You evidently say that the payment of the uttermost farthing is confined to this world. By what right can you deny that it may not also be paid in purgatory? If it be paid in purgatory, then sins are forgiven there. If it be paid in this world, then souls go direct to heaven, which I never denied. The necessity of purgatory to all, forms no portion of the belief of the Catholic church. Thousands may go to heaven without going through purgatory. But if a man should die in venial sin, God is too merciful to consign his soul to eternal damnation. He will purify him, and take him to himself. God, in his mercy will listen to the prayers of the faithful on earth, for those who are placed in such circumstances. The Catholic church, therefore, receives the article of the communion of saints. I shall not attempt to force it upon Protestants—*but let them look to and examine it in the creed.*

My learned friend, Mr. Pope, has frequently referred to the merits of Christ's blood. No one is more ready to plead the

efficacy of the Redeemer's blood than I am; but instead of introducing its glorious merits every moment in a public discussion, I reserve it for more solemn occasions. When I behold a sinner afraid to pray, I draw his attention to the infinite mercy of God; and when the unfortunate man, overwhelmed with the weight of his sins, is on the point of sinking into despair, I awaken his hopes, and arouse him to a sense of his duty, by pointing to the blood of the Lamb, shed for the redemption of man. Mr. Pope says, that the fire mentioned in scripture is merely probationary. I am at a loss to know in that case what our Divine Lord meant by casting into prison until the uttermost farthing should be paid, which had not been remitted "while in the way," that is, in this life, but which should be discharged "in the prison," that is, in the next life. A confusion of ideas seemed to pervade the mind of my friend while addressing himself to this point. To the man who sincerely seeks the truth, the grace of God is given to guide and to direct him. But the influence of grace would not have led my friend into the erroneous interpretation which he endeavoured to affix to this passage of the scriptures.

Mr. Pope has stated correctly the doctrine of the Catholic church, with respect to the persons who go to purgatory. The doctrine of the Catholic church is this:—A man who has committed sin, but who has received absolution—whose heart is penetrated with a sincere contrition for his sins—who has firmly determined never more to offend, and is resolved to make restitution to God and to his neighbor,—such a man may go to heaven directly after his death. But those who have altogether wasted their time here—who have neglected to perform the necessary duties in the way of co-operation for the pardon which they have obtained through the merits of Christ—must be purified in a third place before they can enter the kingdom of heaven. Mr. Pope has said, that Christ preached to those who were in prison, but did not release them. I have heard the assertion with astonishment. Surely, if Christ went to preach, he would not lose the effect of his mission. Christ went to announce to the spirits in prison the glad tidings of redemption, to make known to them his victory over sin and death, and to bring them with him to that paradise which he had promised to the thief upon the cross. Where Christ is, there is paradise. The prison was paradise while Christ was there. With regard to the private opinions of theologians, which Mr. Pope has cited as making against purgatory—even if they did so, (and I trust his quotations are not unfairly taken) I shall merely say, that I am now stating the doctrine of the Catholic church. Mr. Pope has quoted the book of Wisdom, as if it contradicted the book of

Maccabees. I shall just read to you the entire passage referred to, and you will judge whether it is at all contradictory to the book of Maccabees:

"But the souls of the just are in the hand of God, and the torment of death shall not touch them. In the sight of the unwise they seemed to die, and their departure was taken for misery, and their going away for utter destruction; but they are in peace. And though in the sight of men they suffered torments, their hope is full of immortality."—iii, 1—4.

Here the book of Wisdom merely states that the souls of the just go to glory—and so they shall. Does that contradict the doctrine of purgatory? Thousands may go to heaven without going to purgatory—and those who go there, are only on their passage to salvation—so there is here no contradiction whatever.

Mr. Pope has quoted a passage from the 2d book of Maccabees, as if it sanctioned murder. It merely eulogizes the soldiers who died bravely in the defence of their country. Is it murder the writer recommends, when he praises Judas for fighting nobly? With regard to what Mr. Pope said respecting the idols; I grant that those who were slain had committed mortal sin, but was it impossible for them to make an act of sincere contrition before they expired, or in the paroxysms of death, to look to the blood of the long expected Jesus? Was it not lawful on that supposition, for Judas Maccabeus, who was a charitable man, to offer up prayers for their repose? Granting that a third place did exist, was his conduct inconsistent with that doctrine? It is quite impossible for Mr. Pope to prove that the book of Maccabees is not canonical. He has quoted Bishop Fisher against me; It would indeed appear extraordinary if Bishop Fisher, who died a martyr for the Catholic religion—who was put to death by Henry VIII, along with the chancellor, Sir Thomas Moore, because he would not deny the Pope's supremacy—should state what was contrary to the universally acknowledged doctrine of the church. I shall not follow the example of Mr. Pope, and volunteer unmanly allusions to the established church of England. I am not leagued with those pretended friends who conspire her overthrow. I would not conspire to destroy even the temporalities of that church. In her spiritual and apostolic claims, she comes nearest to our own.

Mr. Pope has asked me, why did not Polycarp, who was one of the early Fathers, speak of purgatory? This is a curious negative argument. I might as well conclude, that because a certain historian has not mentioned a certain fact, therefore it never occurred—though vouched for by several other credible and contemporary narrators. There is no mention made by any early historians (the Christian writers excepted) of the miracles of Christ, unless in one passage in Josephus. That

passage has been exploded by critics as not authentic ;—am I, then, from such premises, to conclude that these miracles never were performed ?

I shall now read to you the passages from the Fathers, in reference to the doctrine which forms the subject of discussion this day.

Tertullian says

We have oblations for the dead in the anniversary day."

And to widowers he writes,

"Reflect for whose soul you pray—for whom you make annual oblations."

St. Ephrem of Edessa, in a work entitled his Testament thus proceeds :

"My brethren come to me, and prepare me for my departure, for my strength is wholly gone. Go along with me in psalms, and in your prayers; and please constantly to make oblations for me (προσφορας.) When the thirtieth day shall be completed then remember me; for THE DEAD ARE HELPED BY THE OFFERINGS OF THE LIVING. Now listen with patience to what I shall mention from the Scriptures. Moses bestowed blessings on Reuben after the third generation.—(Deut. xxxiii, 6.) But if the dead are not aided, why was he blessed ? Again, if they be insensible, hear what the Apostle says, 'If the dead rise not again at all, why are they then baptized for them.'—(1 Cor. xv, 29.) If, also, the sons of Mathias (2d Macc. xii,) who celebrated their feasts in figure only, could cleanse those from guilt, by their offerings who fell in battle, how much more so shall the priests of Christ aid the dead by their oblations and prayers."—In Testament. tome iii, p. 294, Edit. Vossil. p. 371, Edit. Oxonii.

St. Cyril, of Jerusalem :

"Then (during service) we pray for the holy Fathers and bishops that are dead; and in short for all those who are departed this life, in *our communion*, believing that their souls receive very great relief by the prayers that are offered for them, while *the holy and tremenduous victim lies upon the altar.* This we will shew you by an example. For I know there are many who say 'What good can it do a soul which is departed out of this life, whether with sins or without them, to be remembered in this sacrifice?' But tell me, I pray you, if a king had sent into banishment some persons that had offended him, and their friends should present him with a crown of immense price, to appease his anger, might not the king on that account, shew some favor to the guilty persons? So do we address our prayers to God for those that are dead, though they were sinners; not by presenting to him a crown, but by offering up to him Christ, who was sacrificed for our sins, that so he, who is so merciful and good, may become gracious to them as well as to us."—Mystigog Cat. pp. 297, 298.

The fourth council of Carthage, canon 79, tome ii, p. 1206. Also, the 29th canon of the preceding council of Carthage, ibidem, p. 1171 :

"Penitents who have carefully submitted to the laws of the heads of the church, should they accidentally die on the road, or by sea, where no assistance could be given, *should be remembered in the prayers and offerings of the faithful.*"

St. Gregory of Nysa, (Orat. pro defunctis. T. ii, p. 1066 7, 8.) says—

"In order that a man might be left to the dignity of free will, and evil at the same time be taken from him, Divine will thus devised: He allows him to remain subject to what himself has chosen, that having tasted of the evil which he desired, and learned by experience how bad an exchange has been made, he might again feel an ardent wish to lay down the load of those vices and inclinations which are contrary to reason; and thus, in this life being renovated by prayers and the pursuit of wisdom, or in the next being expiated by the purging fire, he might recover the state of happiness which he had lost. Man, otherwise, must incline to that side to which his passions tend. But when he has quitted his body, and the difference between virtue and vice is known, he cannot be admitted to approach the Divinity till the purging fire shall have expiated the stains with which his soul was infected. That same fire in others will cancel the corruption of matter and the propensity to evil."

St. Ambrose having, in the preceding part of the chapter, spoken of the effect of penal fire on what the Apostle calls silver and gold, and hay and stubble, thus concludes:

"'We must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ, that every one may receive the proper things of the body, according as he hath done, whether it be good, or whether it be evil.'—(2 Cor. v. 10.) Take care that you carry not with you to the judgment of God, either wood or stubble which the fire may consume. Take care lest, having one of the things that may be approved, you at the same time have much that may give offence. 'If any man's works burn he shall suffer loss; but he himself shall be saved, yet so as by fire.' (1 Cor. iii. 15.) Whence it may be collected, that the same man is saved in part, and condemned in part, (*salvatur ex parte, et condemnatur ex parte.*) Concious, therefore, that there are many judgments, let us examine all our actions. In a man that is just loss is suffered; grievous is the burning of the same work: in the wicked man, wretched is the punishment."—Sermon 20, on Psalm cxviii, t. 2.

And in his comment on the first epistle to the Corinthians—

"'If any man's work burn, he shall suffer loss.' False doctrine, which shall perish, is the work that is said to burn, for all bad things must perish. To suffer loss is to suffer pain. And who that is in pain does not suffer loss? But 'he shall be saved, yet so as by fire.' He will be saved, the Apostle tells us, because his substance shall remain, whilst his bad doctrine shall perish. Therefore he said, 'yet so as by fire,'—in order that his *salvation be not understood to be without pain.* He shows that he shall be saved indeed, but that he shall undergo the pain of fire, and be thus purified; not like the unbelieving and wicked man, who shall be punished in everlasting fire."

In Obitu Valentini—he says, in an apostrophe to the departed emperor,

"Blessed shall you be if my prayers can avail any thing. No day shall pass in which I will not make honorable mention of you; no night, in which you shall not partake of my prayers. In all my *oblations* I will remember you."

And for the emperor Theodosius, deceased, having made a solemn prayer, he thus proceeds:—

"I loved him, therefore will I follow him to the land of the living. I will not leave him till by my prayers and lamentations he shall be admitted to the holy mount of the Lord, to which his deserts call him. *Da requiem perfectam servo tuo Theodosio.*"—Grant, O Lord, perfect repose to thy servant Theodosius."

Mr. Pope rose.—I shall endeavor rapidly to follow my Reverend antagonist through his observations. I shall prove upon his own showing, that some souls were confined one thousand years in purgatory; for if those who had been overwhelmed in the flood, were in the prison of purgatory when Christ died, he will admit, that the flood was somewhat more than one thousand years before the death of Christ. (Mr. Maguire here observed, that they did not go at all to purgatory.) With respect to exercising an act of faith, how can any one exercise it on the authority of the church of Rome, without examining the proofs of that authority? The church of Rome, we are informed, builds her authority upon historical, that is, human testimony. This is somewhat like building castles in the air. My Reverend friend has stated, that there are no merits but the merits of Christ. But, what says the council of Trent?

"If any one shall say, that the good works of a justified person are *so* the gifts of God, that they are not also the the merits of the justified himself; or that the justified person, by the good works which, through the grace of God and the merit of Jesus Christ, of whom he is a living member, are performed by him, does not truly *deserve* an increase of grace, eternal life, and the attainment of eternal life itself, (if he shall depart in grace) and also an increase of glory, let him be accursed."—(Sess. vi, cap. xvi, can. 32.)

What does the doctrine of supererogation mean, if there be no other merits but the merits of Christ? As to the sin against the Holy Ghost, the adorable Saviour (not I) has said, that it is unpardonable; far be it from me, to limit the mercy of God; as far as my humble efforts reach, I would, if possible, preach the gospel to the whole world, publishing free pardon through the blood of the Lamb. My friend has asked, whether the payment of the uttermost farthing refers to earth, or to a future state. The Saviour in St. Matt. is exhorting us to be reconciled *on the way*, that is, in this world. I admit, therefore, at once that "the uttermost farthing" refers to the future state; but I have shown, that the passage speaks of everlasting punishment. With respect to the 1st of Corinthians and 3d chap.; I have already proved that the fire is *probatory* not *purgatorial*, and that it is to try ALL; therefore, the Apostle does not speak of purgatory. My friend has stated, that the mission of Christ to the spirits in prison, could not have been ineffectual. I take him upon his own ground; I ask, did not Christ often preach, without any fruit resulting from his labours? How few were actually converted by the personal ministry of Christ. The death of Christ was retrospective as well as prospective. Abraham rejoiced to see his day. Many through the vista of distant ages, beheld the rising of the star of Jacob, by faith discerned the manifestation of the Son of God, about to offer an atonement for the sins of a ruined world. My friend has said, where Christ is, there is paradise. Did Christ

in answer to the prayer of the penitent thief say, "Yes, I will remember thee; I will go to purgatory for a few moments, but shall leave thee there, to purge away thy sins." 'Tis true, where Christ is, there is happiness, but in heaven happiness supreme there the Redeemer shines forth in all the effulgence of his personal glories. I have shown that the book of Wisdom is against the second book of Maccabees. He says, that the writer of Maccabees commended bravery—"He *struck himself* with his sword," is the expression—I ask, was this dying nobly? The commendation is not that of bravery, but of suicide. (Mr. Maguire here requested Mr. Pope to read the passage. Mr. Pope complied):

"Now as the multitude sought to rush into his house, and to break open the door, and to set fire to it, when he was ready to be taken, he struck himself with his sword, *choosing rather to die nobly*," &c, &c.

My friend has said, that the idolaters might have repented before they died, I answer, had they repented, they would have thrown their idols to the moles and to the bats: but we read, that they were found under their garments.—(2 Macc. xii, 40.) My opponent has said, that Bishop Fisher was a martyr. This circumstance, I should have thought, would have given greater weight to Bishop Fisher's authority, concerning the novelty of purgatory.

My adversary has objected to the negative proofs from Polycarp and others, as if I brought forward no direct testimony Hear St. Clement Romanus:—

"When once we shall have departed this life, there is no room for us in another, either to confess, or to repent."—Ep. ad. Cor. xi, § 8.

Cyprian:—

"The end of the temporal life being accomplished, we are divided into the habitations, either of everlasting death or immortality."—Ad Demetrian. sec. 16

The author of the Questions and Answers, attributed to Justin Martyr, writes thus:—

"After the departure of the soul out of the body, there is presently made a distinction betwixt the just and the unjust: for they are brought by the angels to places fit for them: the souls of the righteous to paradise, where they have the commerce and sight of angels and archangels: the souls of the unjust to the places in hell."—Resp. ad Orthodox. Quæst. 75.

Athanasius says—

"That is not death that befalleth the righteous, but a translation: for they are translated out of this world into everlasting rest: and as a man would go out of a prison, so do the saints go out of this troublesome life, unto those good things that are prepared for them."—De Virgin.

Macarius saith—

"When the holy servants of God remove out of their body, the chorus of

angels receive their souls into their own side into the purer world, and so bring them unto the Lord."—Œgypt. Hom. 22.

Again—"The Lord beholding thy mind that thou fightest and lovest him with thy whole soul, separates death from thy soul in one hour, for this is not hard for him to do; for he taketh thee away in the minute of an hour, and taketh thee into his own bosom and unto light, for he plucketh thee away from the mouth of darkness, and presently translates thee into his own kingdom; for God can easily do all these things in a minute of an hour—this provided only that thou bearest love unto him."—Hom. 36.

I need not referr to other quotations. Some of the passages which my opponent has cited, permit me to say, merely speak of oblations for the dead. At an early period in the history of the church, *thanksgivings* were offered for those who had departed this life in the faith and patience of Jesus Christ. I have followed my friend through some of his ramblings. He talks of sophistry and quibbling, and expresses his wish to come to strong arguments. I would also like to come to strong argument. You will decide whether the proofs of my opponent are fitted to support the quaking foundation on which he stands. I shall now first refer to presumptive arguments against purgatory. It is not probable that a doctrine which makes so wide a distinction between the rich and the poor, should have come from that God who is no respecter of persons, and who has chosen the poor rich in faith, and heirs of the kingdom. This doctrine also savors of inhumanity. I would assist, as far as my ability would enable me, my humblest neighbour, in rescuing from destruction his ox or his ass; but what shall we say of a system, which, believing that masses can assist souls suffering in purgatory, refuses to offer them, UNTIL THE READY CASH IS PAID DOWN! Again the doctrine of purgatory, viewed in the light of holy scripture, is inconsistent with the revealed will of God. St. Paul asks—

"He that spared not his own son, but delivered him up for us all, how shall he not with him also freely give his people all things?—Rom. viii, 32.

"As the heaven is high above the earth, so great is his mercy toward them that fear him."

"He knoweth our frame, he remembereth that we are but dust: like as a father pitieth his children, so the Lord pitieth them that fear him: the mercy of the Lord is from everlasting to everlasting upon them that fear him, and his righteousness unto children's children."—Ps. ciii, 11, 13, 14, 17.

Judgment he calls "his strange work;" "He does not willingly afflict the children of men;" (Lament. iii, 33,) and, if his people are called to taste the cup of sorrow, he sweetens it with many a consoling ingredient by the word of God, and teaching of his spirit. God loves his people with an eternal and unchanging affection. And can I suppose, that He who for their sakes spared not his co-equal and co-eternal Son, will consign them to a place of suffering, when they shall have passed through the miseries of this sinful world? Again this doctrine is derogatory

to the sacrifice of Christ. If it be a fact, that the *one* oblation on the cross is all-sufficient; if the promise of the new covenant runs thus, "thy sins and thine iniquities will I remember no more," "the blood of Christ cleanseth from all sin;" if it be a truth that God "will not give his glory to another," does not the doctrine of purgatory derogate from the sacrifice of Calvary? Hear the council of Trent—

"If any shall say, that after the grace of justification has been received, the offence is so remitted to the penitent sinner, and the guilt of eternal punishment so effaced, that there remains no guilt of temporal punishment to be suffered either in this world, or in the world to come in purgatory, before admission can be obtained to the kingdom of heaven; let him be accursed." Sess. vi, cap. xvi, can. 30.

Oh, my friends, what blasphemy is such language against that Redeemer who bowed the heavens and came down amongst us—who lifted off the curse of heaven's violated law, and redeemed the immortal soul by his own blood!—David says,

"As far as the east is from the west, so far hath he removed our iniquities from us: who forgiveth *all* thy iniquities: who healeth *all* thy diseases."—Ps. cii, 12, 13.

In Isaiah we read,

"I am, I am he, that blot out thy iniquities for my own sake, and I will not remember thy sins."—xliii, 25.

"I will forgive their iniquity, and I will remember their sin no more." Jer. xxxi, 34.

"Thou shalt sprinkle me with hyssop, and I shall be cleansed: thou shalt wash me, and I shall be whiter than snow."—Ps. i, ix.

"If your sins be as scarlet, they shall be made white as snow: and if they be red as crimson, they shall be white as wool."—Isaiah i, 18.

And yet the believer, according to the church of Rome, requires fire to make his sins whiter than snow!

Do I not read, Isaiah xxxviii, 17

"But thou hast delivered my soul that it should not perish: thou hast cast *all* my sins behind thy back."

Do I not read, John i, 29,

"Behold the Lamb of God, behold him who taketh away the sins of the world."

And again, 1 John i, 7,

"The blood of Jesus Christ, his Son, cleanseth us from *all* sin."

And at the 9th verse,

"If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from *all* iniquity."

In Colossians we read

"You, when you were dead in your sins, and the uncircumcision of your flesh, he hath quickened together with him; forgiving you *all* offences."—ii 14

What says the prophet Micah, vii, 19.

"He will turn again, and have mercy on us: he will put away our iniquities; and he will cast *all* our sins into the bottom of the sea."

We read that,

"Other foundation can no man lay save that which has been laid, which is Christ Jesus."—1 Cor. iii, 11.

The Apostle Paul speaks of confidence—

"Their sins and iniquities will I remember no more; now where remission of these is, there is no more an offering for sin."

"Having therefore, brethren, boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus, by a new and living way which he hath consecrated for us through the vail, that is to say, his flesh, and having an high priest over the house of God, let us draw near with a true heart, in full assurance of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience."—Heb. x, 19, 22.

Mr. Maguire would be justified in censuring confidence, if the believer placed his dependance on his own works for salvation: but confidence is warranted, when exclusively built upon the foundation laid in Zion, the obedience unto death of the Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. St. Paul says—

"God commendeth his charity towards us, because when as yet we were sinners, according to the time, Christ died for us; much more therefore, being now justified by his blood, shall we be saved from wrath through him; for if when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son, much more being reconciled shall we be saved through his life."—Rom. v, 8, 10.

What is the meaning of the Apostle's argument?

"If when we were enemies we were reconciled to God, by the death of his Son, *much more*, after we have been reconciled *shall we be saved* by his life."

I would argue, that if, when we were *enemies*, God reconciled us to himself, surely he will not consign the sinner to such a place of torment as purgatory, after he has become *his adopted child*

"There is no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus," (says St. Paul, Rom. viii, 1.)

"Amen, Amen, I say unto you, he who heareth my word, and believeth him that sent me, *hath* life everlasting, and cometh not into judgment, but *is passed from death to life*."—John, v, 24.

I say, if there be no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus, surely the Deity, who is infinite in justice, would not consign the believer, against whom there is no condemnation, to the tortures of purgatory. St. Paul writes,

"Who shall lay any thing to the charge of God's elect? It is God that justifieth. Who is he that condemneth? It is Christ that died, yea, rather, that is risen again, who is even at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us. Who shall separate us from the love of Christ? Shall tribulation or distress, or persecution, or famine, or nakedness, or peril, or sword: as it written, for thy sake we are killed all the day long, we are accounted as sheep for the slaughter; nay, in all these things we are *more than conquerors*, through him that hath loved us. For I am persuaded, that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature,

shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord.—Rom. viii, 33, 39.

The Douay version of the commencement of the passage which I have read, is absurd. To the question, "Who shall accuse against the elect of God?" the Douay Bible replies, "God that justifieth:" as if the God who justifies, was the accuser of his elect. And again, to the question, "Who is he that shall condemn?" The Douay translation answers, "Christ Jesus that died:" as if the Saviour condemned his people. By the way, I may mention that Griesbach beautifully elucidates the passage, by placing a mark of interrogation after the expression "God that justifieth," and at the end of the 34th verse; the meaning of the passage will then be—who shall lay any thing to the charge of God's elect? Shall the God who justifies them, lay any thing to their charge? Who is he that shall condemn? Shall Christ condemn, who died, and having been exalted to the right hand of the everlasting throne intercedes for his people? I say with Paul, "If God be for his people, who shall be against them?" If God acquits them, shall the church of Rome condemn them to purgatory?

I shall fill up the few minutes that remain, by reading to you quotations from several *Roman catholic writers*, which clearly show, that during the dark ages the state of things was such, that opinions the most monstrous could with facility have been introduced.

A bishop of the church, in year 900, thus complains:

"So great folly now oppresseth the miserable world, that at this day more absurd things are believed by Christians than ever any could impose upon the blind pagans."—Agoberd. Epis. Lug. Lib. de Grandi, &c.

Sabellius saith,

"It is wonderful to observe, what a strange forgetfulness of all arts did about this time seize upon men, insomuch that neither the Popes nor other princes seemed to have any sense or apprehension of any thing that might be useful to human life. There were no wholesome laws, no reparations of churches, no pursuit of liberal arts; but a kind of stupidity, and madness, and forgetfulness of manners had possessed the minds of men."

And a little after,—"I cannot," says he "but much wonder from whence these tragical examples of the Popes should spring, and how their minds should come to be so devoid of all piety, as neither to regard the person which they sustained, nor the place they were in.—Enead. 9, Lib. i, 900.

Phil. Burgomansis says—

"It happened in that age, through the slothfulness of men, that there was a general decay of virtue, both in *the head* and in the members."—(Ann. 906.)

I wonder who *the Head* was? And again,

"These times, through the ambition and cruel tyranny of the Popes, were extremely unhappy; for the Popes setting aside the fear of God and his worship, fell into such enmities among themselves, as cruel tyrants exercise towards one another."—(Ann. 908.)

And Platina, their own writer, in his History of the Popes, gives the following account of their barbarities to their predecessors, though many years deceased.

"These Popes minded nothing else but how they might extinguish both the name and dignity of their predecessors."

Sigonius, speaking of these times, about the commencement of the 10th century, calls them—

"The foulest and blackest, both in respect to the wickedness of the princes and madness of the people, that are to be found in all antiquity."—De Regn. Ital. Lib. 6.

Genebrard, speaking of the same time, observes,

"This is called the unhappy age, being destitute of men eminent for wit and learning; as also of famous princes and Popes. In this time there was scarce any thing done worthy to be remembered by posterity."—Chron. Lib. 4.

Gerbert, about the beginning of the eleventh century, gives this brief character of the Roman Church, in his Epist. 40,

"The world stands amazed at the manners of Rome."

Werner gives this character of these times in these words:

"About the year of our Lord one thousand, there began an effeminate time, in which the Christian faith began to degenerate exceedingly, and to decline from its ancient vigour; insomuch, that in many countries of Christendom, neither sacraments, nor ecclesiastical rites were observed; and people were given to soothsaying, and witchcrafts; and the priest was like the people."—Fac Temporum.

Strong indeed is the complaint of a great prelate. He says—

"In the west, and almost all the world over, especially among those who are called the faithful, faith failed, and there was no fear of God among them. Justice was perished from among men, and violence prevailing against equity, governed the nations. Fraud, deceit and the acts of cozenage were grown universal. All kind of virtue gave way as an useless thing and wickedness supplied its place. The world seemed to be declining apace towards its evening, and the second coming of the Son of Man to draw near: for love was grown cold, and faith was not found on earth. All things were in confusion, and the world looked as if it would return again to its old chaos. All sorts * * * * * * * were committed with the same freedom as if they had been lawful actions; for men neither blushed at them, nor were punished for them. Nor did the clergy live better than the people; for the bishops were negligent of the duty of their place, &c, &c. In a word, men run themselves headlong into all vice, and all flesh had corrupted its way."—Bell. Sacr. Lib. 1, cap. 18.

Such was the state of things in the dark ages, when princes bowed their knee to the Pope—did any improvement afterwards takes place?

St. Bernard in the thirteenth century, complain thus,

"We cannot now say, as is the people, so is the priest; for the people are not so bad as the priests."—In Conv. S. Pauli. Ser. 1.

And again, "The bishops to whom the church of God is now committed, are not teachers but seducers, not pastors but impostors, not prelates but Pilates."

Mr. MAGUIRE—I agree probably with Mr. Pope in a great portion of what he has quoted from Scripture. When Mr. Pope talks of a detention for one thousand years in purgatory, and speaks of those who were overwhelmed by the deluge, I have only to say, that as they died in mortal sin, they could not therefore get admission even to purgatory. The patriarchs departed in peace with God, but I affirm that they were detained in prison until our Saviour came to them after his death, to announce the glorious tidings of salvation. For no man could enter heaven unless through the infinite merits of Christ crucified. The patriarchs remained in a third place until released by Christ. This is a point of Catholic doctrine. The onus lies on Mr. Pope to show that that third place has ceased to exist.

As to the text quoted relative to the sin against the Holy Ghost, St. Augustine, St. Cyprian, and a variety of more recent commentators, declare that it is to be understood, like the text concerning the rich man, not of an absolute impossibility, but of great, perhaps extreme difficulty; that is, the grace of repentance must come from the Holy Ghost. Now he who attributes the work of the Holy Ghost to the Devil, cannot receive such grace, therefore his salvation must be a matter of great, of rare difficulty—since his repentance depends upon the spirit he blasphemes. But if the heart of the man who has even committed such a sin shall, in the course of time, become thoroughly changed—if he shall sincerely and heartily repent, will Mr. Pope say that our Saviour will not extend forgiveness to that man? That is the opinion of some Protestant Divines; but it never shall be mine. I said that there was no pain where Christ was. My friend retorted, and affirmed that wherever Christ was present, there were heaven and happiness. He concluded this portion of his argment with an appeal to the feelings of the meeting. I shall make no efforts to excite your feelings or to bring into play your prejudices and passions. My only appeal shall be to direct and positive arguments.

Mr. Pope referred to what is said of Nicanor in the book of Maccabees, in order to prove that that book was not canonical or inspired. Do we not read in the book of Judges that Jepthe, who is there recorded as the ruler of the people of Goland—who is spoken of as a valiant man, slew his own daughter, in pursuance of a vow made to God. Are we, therefore, to reject as uncanonical the book in which this is recorded? Do we not read of Moses having murdered the Egyptian—of a father having children by his own two daughters. Are the books in which those facts are re ated to be discarded as uncanonical?

Did Mr. Pope quote any passages to prove that the righteous must go directly to heaven, without passing through purgatory

If the just man fall seven times a day, is it derogating from the merits of Christ to say, that that man must suffer for a time in purgatory? Did not our Saviour annex conditions to our obtaining salvation, such as baptism,—without which the atonement on the cross cannot be applied to us? Christ will not redeem us unless we are washed in the waters of baptism. Does he any where say, that man will be justified by faith only, without baptism?

With regard to the belief of the Greek church, on the subject of purgatory, I have here the translation of Dupin's Ecclesiastical History, by a Protestant, and from it I shall read the following passage:

"It is evident from some very ancient records of the church, that it was a custom among the christians, *ab antiquo*, to pray for the souls of the faithful departed, in the dreadful mysteries. St. Chrysostom plainly tells us, that it was decreed by the Apostles. It is certain, that it was in use about two hundred years after Christ. This is proved from Tertullian, who thus speaks, 'let the faithful widow pray for the soul of her husband.' This we find practised by many of the most eminent Fathers of the church."

I have already proved by quotations from Tertullian, St. Cyprian, and other most eminent Fathers, that during the first five hundred years of the Christian era, it was the practice of the church to pray for the dead. And I have shown in the foregoing extract, what is the opinion of the Greek church. When Claude, the Huguenot, was engaged in the celebrated conference with Bossuet, he went to the trouble of writing to the Greek church, in order to ascertain their opinions on the doctrines of transubstantiation, purgatory, and the invocation of saints. A council of the Greek church was assembled, and the bishops who attended solemnly decided, that they held the doctrine of the real presence of Christ in the sacrament, the doctrine of purgatory, and of the invocation of saints.

With respect to the character of the Catholic church, the following passage is taken from the works of the celebrated Dr. Jeremy Taylor, whose orthodoxy will not surely be questioned by Mr. Pope:

"There are many considerations in the Catholic church, which may retain persons of much reason, and more piety, in its communion. They know it to have been the religion of their forefathers, which had possession of men's understandings *before Protestantism had a name.* First, its *doctrines* had a long continuance and possession of the church; which, therefore, cannot be easily supposed in the present possessors to be a design, since they have received it from so many ages. Its long *prescription,* which is such a prejudice, as cannot with many arguments be retrenched, as relying upon these grounds, that truth is more ancient than falsehood; that God would not, for so many ages, forsake his church and leave her in error. Then comes the splendour and beauty of that church; its pompous service, the stateliness and solemnity of its hierarchy, its name 'Catholic,' the antiquity of its doctrines, the continual succession of its bishops, and their immediate derivation from the Apostles. Add to this the multitude and variety of people which are of its persuasion, the consent of elder ages, the great consent of one part with

another contrasted with the great differences which are commenced among their adversaries. To this again add its happiness in being the instrument in converting divers nations—the piety and austerity of its religious orders—the single life of its priests and bishops—the severity of its fasts—the great reputation of its bishops for faith and sanctity—the known holiness of some of its religious founders of orders—its miracles—the accidents and casualties which have happened to its adversaries, the oblique acts and indirect proceedings of some of those who have departed from it, and above all, the name of heretic and schismatic which the Catholic church has fastened on them. Protestants commit themselves by the conduct of the new reformers—at first, a few and of the lowest rank of the clergy, being made under ecclesiastical censures, assisted against their spiritual superiors by some secular powers, when both these and they were subject to that ecclesiastical hierarchy, which they opposed."

The following passage is taken from Sir Edwin Sandys' Relation of the Western Religion:—*

"The Catholic church was founded by the Apostles, with promise, that the gates of hell should not prevail against it. It has continued on now, till the end of 1600 years, with an honourable line of near two hundred and forty Popes, successors of St. Peter,—both tyrants, traitors, pagans, and heretics, in vain wresting, raging, and undermining it. All the general councils, that ever were in the world have approved and honoured it. God hath miraculously blest it from above, so that many doctors have enriched it with their writings; armies of saints have embellished it with their holiness; martyrs with their blood; virgins with their purity. Even at this day, amid the difficulties of unjust rebellions, and the unnatural revolts of her nearest children, yet she stretcheth out her arms to the utmost corners of the world, newly embracing whole nations into her bosom. In all other opposite churches there are found inward dissensions and contrariety; change of opinions, uncertainty of resolutions, with robbing of churches, rebelling against governors, and confusion of order. In the Catholic church there is undivided unity; resolutions unalterable; the most heavenly order, reaching from the height of all power to the lowest of all subjection; all with admirable harmony, and undefective correspondence, bending the same way, to the effecting of the same work," &c.

The venerable and learned Earl Fitzwilliam, in his Letters of Atticus, thus speaks of the Catholic church:

"How I am struck with admiration, when I come to consider the antiquity of this venerable Roman church; its vast extent; the majesty, the magnificence, the symmetry of its edifice; its immutable stability amid all the persecution which it has undergone; its admirable discipline, which seems traced out by the hand of supernatural wisdom; the impotence of its adversaries, notwithsanding all their sophistry, invectives, and calumnies; when I contemplate the dignity, the virtue, the talents of its apologists; the vices, the dishonesty of its first assailants; the total extinction of so many sects, which have risen up against it; the little consistency of the present sects; their variations on points of doctrine," &c.

The ministers of the French reformed churches, in a memorial, which they presented to the government, in the 1750, express themselves upon this subject, in the following manner:—

"We do not dissemble, that in the parallel, which we sometimes make between your church and ours, the striking features, notwithstanding some abuses, are on your side. You certainly existed before we did, since you

* See Note on this passage appended to Mr. Pope's Second Speech on Fourth Day

origin is coeval with that of the Apostles. Whilst, as for us, we have not yet existed three centuries: since in 1515, both your ancestors and ours communicated at the same mass: celebrated together the feast of Easter. and lived in perfect unanimity of sentiment. Moreover, the chain of tradition, whose first link was attached by Peter and Paul to the church of Rome, has been in such manner preserved amongst you, that, if the Irenæuses, the Gregories, the Athanasiuses, the Chrysostoms, were now again to return to the earth, it would be in the church of Rome alone, that they would find that society, of which, once, they had been the members."

It was such considerations as these that induced Henry the Fourth of France, to abandon the Protestant, and embrace the Catholic religion.—

"When this illustrious hero, previously to his conversion, was induced to study the Catholic religion, he proposed, through the medium of Sully, a variety of questions to the Protestant ministers. Amongst others he proposed the following:—'Whether it was lawful for him to become a Catholic? Their reply was:—'That it was lawful for him to become a Catholic: seeing, that salvation is attainable in the Catholic church.' They added, it is true, 'Our religion is the more perfect; but still, the church of Rome is sufficient for all the securities of future happiness.' This answer obtained,—the monarch now consulted the Catholic prelates and theologians respecting the security of salvation in the Protestant church. But, he could not find one single individual amongst these, that would allow such benefit to exist in this society. Whence, he reasoned in this manner with the Protestant ministers: 'You pretend,' he said to them, 'that, by continuing in your communion, my religious state is more perfect, than if I were to become a Catholic; whilst, at the same time, you own, that I may be saved in the Catholic church. Now, the Catholics, on the contrary, all maintain that salvation is not attainable in your religion; but that it is confined to the church of Rome. So that, by uniting myself to the church of Rome, I may be saved, both according to your acknowledgment and theirs. Therefore, I should be the maddest of men, if, in a business of such infinite importance, I did not take the safest side; *consequently, I decide in favour of the church of Rome*, in which, by the acknowledgment of all the world, and even of the men who are the most opposed to each other—my salvation is secure.'"

Such was the reasoning, and such the decision, of Henry. They were, alike, the dictates of good sense and prudence. The declaration of the Protestant university of Helmstadt, in the case of the Protestant princess of Wolfenbuttle, who was destined to be married to the archduke of Austria, is similar to the preceding one of the French reformed ministers, and presents the same kind of inference. The members of the above university, in the year 1707, were consulted,

"Whether in the consideration of the proposed marriage, the princess might, in conscience, embrace the Catholic religion?"

The answer, delivered in the form of a declaration, was to the following effect:—

"First, that the difference between the Protestant and the Catholic religions is not fundamental. Secondly, that is therefore lawful to pass from the Protestant to the Catholic church."

Mr. Pope, you will be pleased to recollect, drew a frightful picture of this same Catholic church, and described some of the

Popes in the dark ages as execrable characters. I will not deny—indeed, I have already admitted, that there were some bad characters among the Popes—but they were few in number. Were there not bad she Popes in England?

Mr. Pope spoke of the dissolute lives of the clergy, but he does not describe more faithfully than does Reeve, in his Ecclesiastical History, the dissoluteness and neglect of morals which brought on the Reformation. A reformation was decidedly required, but it was a reformation in morals. Such a reformation as the Almighty would bring about, by the instrumentality of good and virtuous characters. Mr. Pope quotes a passage from David: "Wash me yet more from my iniquity and cleanse me from my sin." Here is the strongest proof that David had been already forgiven his sins, and his supplication to the Lord to wash *him still more*, shows that the temporal punishment of the sin remains after the eternal had been remitted. David adds—"For I know my iniquity, and my sin is always before me." David well knew the effects of sin—he was aware, that though the eternal punishment due for his iniquities had, through the mercy of God, been remitted, that still he had a further account to render, and that a temporal punishment was still to be inflicted.

Mr. Pope has endeavoured to work upon the feelings of his auditory, by continual appeals to the merits of the Redeemer's sacrifice. Did I ever deny that the merits of Christ's blood washed out all sin? But who will deny that a moral martyrdom will render us more acceptable in the eyes of the Redeemer? Who will assert, that if Christ grants favours to us, we should not labour to render ourselves, in a certain degree, deserving of them? Will not a master be more ready to grant favours to a servant, in proportion as that servant becomes entitled to them by his good and moral conduct? Though I am not, like Mr. Pope, always dwelling upon the merits of our Redeemer's blood, which should never be introduced but with reverence and awe, yet I am always ready to assert my faith in their infinite and glorious efficacy. Mr. Pope has spoken of the confidence of the true believers—I would remind those who possess such confidence to beware. I would tell them, in the language of scripture, to "take heed lest they fall." The inspired writer says, "that no man knoweth whether he be worthy of love or hatred," and our Saviour says, "Learn of me, because I am meek and humble of heart." If meekness and humility were more prevalent at the present day, this discussion had never taken place. I have been upwards of nine years in the mission, and I never preached a controversial sermon, until I found the Biblicals assailing my flock in all quarters—until I saw wolves in sheep's clothing, endeavouring to lead them from their faith, and car

ying on their operations with a tract in one hand and the money in the other—I then found it necessary to stand forward and protect the religious principles of that flock, over which I was appointed the spiritual guardian and guide.

The council of Trent never said, that the merits of the saints can avail any thing *per se*. They merely serve others through the blood of Jesus Christ. Christ is the door through which we shall enter—He is the vine—we are the branches—and whatever good works we may perform, or whatever merits we may possess, are not to be attributed to us, but to that divine tree whence we spring, and from which we derive our life and nourishment. Let every pastor take care of his flock—I do not, in that respect, invade the rights of others. Mr. Pope may say, that he is commissioned to preach to my flock, but I deny the fact. I say that he has no ordinary mission to do so, and he must prove an extraordinary mission by miracles, as Christ and Moses did. If he have an extraordinary mission, let him give us such proofs of it, and I am ready to join with him.

I merely wish on this occasion to employ argument, not rhetoric; and to appeal, not to your prejudices and passions, but to the sober reflections of your understandings. If I shall be able to remove the prejudices of the honest amongst my Protestant countrymen, I shall consider myself as having achieved much.

During the heat of the Reformation, it will be allowed that expressions escaped from the exasperated parties on both sides which had better been forgotten. We Catholics may appeal to the learned and honest Thorndyke, who in his "Just Weights and Measures," says,

"The worship of the Host is not idolatry, for the flesh and blood of Christ is no idol to Christians, wheresoever he is worshipped. He that worships the Host believes the Lord Jesus Christ to be the only true God, hypostatically united to our flesh and blood; which being present in the Eucharist in such manner as he is not present every where, there is due occasion to give it that worship in the Eucharist, with which the Godhead in our manhood is to be worshipped with upon all occasions. Will any Papist acknowledge that he honours the elements of the Eucharist for God? Will common sense charge him with honouring that in the sacrament which he does not believe to be there? This is a calumny by which Protestants lead the public by the nose."

He subsequently adds,

'They that separate from the church of Rome, as being idolatrous, are thereby schismatics before God."

Mr. Pope has attacked the Catholic clergy for receiving money for saying masses. The Catholic clergy depend for support upon their flocks; they possess not the tithes and green acres, and the fat of the land. Give them a certain portion of the tithes and glebes, and I promise you they will never look to

me poor, even for the most trifling compensation We read that the labourer is worthy of his hire, and that he who preaches the gospel should live by the gospel. Surely Mr. Pope will not assert the contrary.

Mr. Pope.—My opponent has acknowledged, that they who perished in the flood, died in mortal sin. Therefore, according to Mr. Maguire's own showing, as those spirits were confined in the prison spoken of by St. Peter, the prison could not have been purgatory. My friend says, that the onus lies on me to prove that there is not a third place. I reply, that the onus rests on Mr. Maguire to prove the existence of a third place, and also to show, that that third place is purgatory. He asks, if there was the disposition to repent, would not God forgive the sin against the Holy Ghost? Every one who possesses repentance towards God, and faith towards our Lord Jesus Christ, is accepted of him; but this sin, whatever it be, appears to inflict the awful punishment of judicial blindness. Mr. Maguire has himself admitted, that the sin is unpardonable. I do not decide, whether this sin can be committed in the present day; perhaps, the commission of it was confined to the times of the Saviour—Mr. Maguire alludes to the cases of Lot and of Jephtha. I answer, that the scriptures, as a faithful history of human nature, must contain narratives of crime; but yet, do we ever find the sacred volume speaking of acts of depravity, in language of sanction and commendation? Does the question need a reply? The criminal act is either pointedly condemned in the immediate context of the narration, or by the spirit and precepts of the inspired volume. But what are we to think of the book of Maccabees, which not merely *relates* an act of suicide; but positively *commends* it; "Choosing rather to die *nobly*, Nicanor struck himself with his sword?" Is this the authority of inspiration? Is this bravery, to fear to meet death by the arm of another, and choose rather to fall on his own sword? My friend has alluded to circumcision and baptism. I would say of baptism, what Paul said of circumcision:

"He is not a Jew, which is one outwardly; neither is that circumcision which is outward in the flesh: but he is a Jew which is one inwardly; and circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter; whose praise is not of men, but of God."—Rom. ii, 28, 29.

I believe that God will never exclude a sinner from heaven, if his dependance be founded upon the blood of Jesus, though he be not baptized. Mr. Maguire appears to have a high respect for the Established church. I would refer him to her catechism, which says, that "the sacraments of baptism and the Lord's supper, are *generally* necessary to salvation." She does

not say 'absolutely and essentially.' Mr. Maguire has said that the Redeemer made salvation depend upon baptism as a condition. "He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved, he that believeth not shall be condemned." It does not say, he that is not baptized shall be condemned. Taking him on his own ground, I would ask, does he mean to draw a parallel between baptism and the excruciating torments of purgatory *even* as conditions of salvation? When the jailer at Philippi asked, what shall I do to be saved? St. Paul simply replied "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved;" afterwards I admit, that he administered baptism as the initiating right of Christian communion. My friend has referred to the Greek church—the authority of the Greek church weighs but little with me. The statement that the Greeks did not believe in purgatory, was a quotation from Fisher, the Roman Catholic bishop. I omitted to notice one of my friend's quotations from scripture in support of purgatory. The omission was of little consequence, as in truth, the passage is perfectly and altogether irrelevant. I shall read to you the context.

"We would not have you ignorant, brethren, of our tribulation which came to us in Asia, that we were pressed out of measure, above our strength, so that we were weary even of life. But we had in ourselves the answer of death, that we should not trust in ourselves, but in God who raiseth the dead, who hath delivered, and doth deliver us out of so great dangers: in whom we trust that he will yet also deliver us, you helping withal in prayer for us; that for this gift obtained for us, by the means of many persons, thanks may be given by many in our behalf."—2 Cor. i, 8, 11.

The last verse which I have read, is that which my opponent adduced. Here is nothing about purgatory or prayers for the dead; were the Apostles on earth, or in the world of spirits, when this verse was penned? Need I offer any further comment to show that no connexion exists between this passage and the doctrine of purgatory.

The verse is just as much connected with purgatory, as that which is commonly used as the motto of purgatorian societies—

"Have pity on me, have pity on me, at least you my friends, for the hand of the Lord hath touched me."—Job. xix, 21.

A short time since I placed in the hands of a Roman Catholic a Douay Bible, and called his attention to the passage; and great indeed was his astonishment, when he found that it was uttered by Job, when Job was on earth. My friend asked, why David prayed for the forgiveness of his sins after pardon had been announced to him by Nathan, if his sins were altogether blotted out. I answer, the Christian is conscious that the just man falleth seven times a day, and living by faith, requires every moment to cry out, "Purge me with hyssop and I shall be clean."

by reason of the guilt which he is continually, and I may perhaps say, sometimes insensibly, contracting. Compare the declaration of the council of Trent, on the merit of good works already quoted, with the sacred volume The Bible says,

"The wages of sin is death, but the *gift* of God is eternal life, through Jesus Christ our Lord."—Rom. vi, 23.

Here is the council of Trent against God himself. My friend spoke about confidence; the confidence of which I spoke was built upon the blood of Christ. He desired those who stood to take heed lest they fall. I pray that I may be enabled to comply with the exhortation, God bestowing upon me an humble spirit. My opponent has stated that the Apostle says,

"No man knows whether he be worthy of love or hatred."

I must confess that I have never met with the passage in the sacred scriptures.

Mr. Maguire deprecates the idea of standing here this day. Had I not seen the passage in the *Register*, which is regarded as the organ of Roman Catholic proceedings, this meeting would never have taken place. With respect to personalities I shall take no notice of them.

A passage in the sixth Æneid of Virgil, as translated by Dryden, will serve to throw light upon the origin of purgatory

"Nor death itself can wholly wash their stains,
But long contracted filth even in the soul remains.
The relics of inveterate vice they wear,
And spots of sin obscure in every face appear;
For this are various penances enjoined,
And some are hung to bleach upon the wind,
Some plunged in waters, others purged in fires,
'Till all the dregs are drained, and all the rust expires.
* * * * * *
Then are they happy, when by length of time
The scruff is worn away, of each committed crime;
No speck is left of their habitual stains,
But the pure æther of the soul remains."

One would think that Virgil saw prospectively the purgatory of the church of Rome. Here permit me to make a remark, that I cannot discover, by what process fire, which is material, can purify an immaterial essence. I proceed to demonstrate from the sacred volume, in addition to the arguments which have been already adduced in refutation of the doctrine of purgatory, that the souls of believers pass after death immediately to everlasting rest. If the blood of Jesus Christ *cleanseth from all* sin, then assuredly the man, who has thus been cleansed, is translated at once into the realms of eternal glory.

In the fourth book of Kings, (or, as we have it, the second and twenty-second chapter, it is written,

"Therefore, I will gather thee to thy Fathers, and thou shalt be gathered to thy sepulchre in peace, that thine eyes may not see all the evils which will bring upon this place."

I ask, would such a promise have been made to king Josiah, if the soul was to pass from the trials of this world to the agonizing sufferings of a purgatorial fire. In the second of Corinthians, chap. v, 1st to 8th verse, the Apostle writes:

"For we knew, if our earthly house of this habitation be dissolved, that we have a building of God, a house not made with hands, eternal in heaven; for in this also we groan, desiring to be clothed upon with our habitation that is from heaven; yet, so that we be found clothed, not naked; for we also who are in the tabernacle do groan, being burthened, because we would not be unclothed, but clothed upon, that that which is mortal may be swallowed up by life. Now, he that maketh us for this very thing is God; who hath given us the pledge of the Spirit; therefore, having all this confidence, knowing, that while we are in the body, we are absent from the Lord; for we walk by faith and not by sight; but we are confident, and have a good will to be absent rather from the body, and to be present with the Lord."

Would the Apostle have made use of such language, if he believed that he had to pass through a purgatory?

"To be absent from the body" and "to be present with the Lord," we find, are in the case of the believer, according to the Apostle, synonymous expressions: and "in the body," and "absent from the Lord," are likewise identified. The Apostle says, in Philippians first chapter 21st to 23d verse:

"To me to live is Christ, and to die is gain; and if to live in the flesh, this is to me the fruit of labour; and what I shall choose I know not; but I am straightened between two, having a desire to be dissolved, and to be with Christ, a thing by far the better."

A passage which is still more direct, is found in the thirteenth verse of the fourteenth chapter of Revelations:

"And I heard a voice from heaven, saying unto me, write, *Blessed are* the dead which die in the Lord, from henceforth; yea saith the Spirit, that *they may rest from their labours*, and their works do follow them."

Why are those who die in the Lord, blessed? Is it, that, delivered from the toils of the flesh, they go to purgatory? Are they blessed, if enduring the intensity of purgatorial fire? No; but through the grace of God, when the summons goeth forth, they are translated from the changes and sorrows of this mortal scene to the regions of eternal felicity. Surely the child of God, instead of in any degree looking forward to the period of his dissolution as the commencement of eternal blessedness, if he must first pass through the lake of purgatorial fire, would doubtless stand shivering on the brink. The people of God whether they live or die, are the Lord's. Would the Apostle assert that the Lord's people are blessed after death, if they had to suffer in purgatory on their way to glory? I have spoken on Mr. Maguire's arguments; I have considered his quotations from

scripture, and proved that they do not support the doctrine of purgatory: I have shown that such a tenet is inconsistent with the character of God, and derogatory to the Redeemer's sacrifice. We have seen, upon the testimony of holy writ, that the blood of Jesus Christ is perfectly competent for the salvation of sinners: we have seen Fathers against Fathers: I trust, we shall no longer repose implicit dependance upon them. The Bible, and the Bible alone, as the revelation of God, is the word by which we shall be judged. That word directly shows us, that the soul of the real Christian having been emancipated from the body passes immediately to a state of felicity. We have also seen, that the doctrine of purgatory carries on the very face of it a contradiction to the sacred scriptures, in the distinction which it establishes between the rich and the poor. And here I would join issue with one who was well acquainted with the system of the church of Rome, a converted priest: and if I use strong expressions, I mean no offence to the feelings of my Roman Catholic auditors—but I would endeavour to reach the judgment and the conscience. The writer to whom I allude says,

"The doctrine of purgatory is of heathen origin, intended to cheat the simple out of their money, by giving them bills of exchange upon another world for cash paid in this, without any danger of the bills returning protested."—Meagher.

Spare your smiles, my friends: the subject is too momentous: it is the salvation of the immortal and never-dying spirit, on which we are discoursing; it is the honor of Emmanuel's atonement that we are vindicating. Will you not, in agreement with scripture, give your universal verdict against a doctrine which would rob the believer of his peace, which would throw around the glorious attributes of heaven's sovereign, the funeral pall of darkness and abscurity, which would transform a God of love into a God of terror, mingle our paltry "satisfactions" with the agonies of Calvary, and attach to the seamless robe of Christ's righteousness, woven from Bethlehem to the Cross, the tattered vestments of personal suffering? As to men of sense, I appeal to the Roman Catholic clergy. Though we differ, still, as a friend, I would say, "take care lest you are not bringing down upon your heads the curses of innumerable immortal spirits." We are all on our progress to an eternal world; we must all onward, whether we will or not, to our journey's end; our pilgrimage will soon terminate, and the exclusive objects of our concern then will be the great realities of an eternal world. Let us then, Protestant and Roman Catholics, while we are on the way, look to Jesus, the only hope set before sinners; let us kiss the Son, lest he be angry, and the door of mercy be for ever closed.

Mr. MAGUIRE.—Gentlemen, after the very pathetic sermon which you have just heard, the feelings of many of you must be in no small degree excited. I shall merely observe that I have not come here to preach, but to argue—to examine evidence, and expose sophistry. Mr. Pope has given us a history of witchcraft in the tenth century.—It is but a few days ago that several men were tried in Bible-reading England, for assaulting and nearly killing a poor old woman under the impression that she was a witch. She was supposed to have bewitched a colt, and she was actually made to go under the colt's tail and pray for its health and prosperity! This occurred in England where there are ten Bibles for one head. Mr. Pope calls the sin against the Holy Ghost an act of judicial blindness. Does he hold that for a sin which a man has committed fifty years before his death, and for which he has sincerely repented, the gates of heaven will be shut against him, and he will be condemned to eternal reprobation? Is Christ's blood to be of no avail to that repentant sinner? Is such the doctrine of Mr. Pope? I beseech you all to examine the New Testament, and you will find in almost every page of it, a contradiction to such a doctrine. I may here beg to recall your senses which have been floating upon that magical hemisphere created by the wonderful eloquence of my friend, and direct your attention to the arguments he has advanced. Mr. Pope says that the sacraments of the church of England, namely, baptism, and the Lord's supper, are *generally* necessary to salvation. Mr. Pope should understand the word "generally," as theologians do, to mean that in some instances the sacraments may be dispensed with; for martyrdom, in the opinion of theologians, suffices as a substitute for baptism. If Mr. Pope understands "generally," in that sense, I quite agree with him. But if he denies that baptism is necessary to all Christians *who have the opportunity of receiving it*, as a requisite for salvation, I propose to him the distinct text of scripture—

"Amen, I say unto you except a man be born again of water and the Holy Ghost he cannot have life in him."

If the God of heaven thought fit to appoint a third place for the purifying of souls from sin after their departure from this life, is not Mr Pope guilty of blasphemy, in thus calling the all-wise God to an account? Christ does not derogate from the efficacy of his own merits by the establishment of a third place; and the only question is, was there such a place *de facto* established? Mr. Pope has argued all through upon the assumption that I believe that all souls should go to purgatory in the first instance—I hope on the contrary, that many go direct to heaven,

and a few comparatively to purgatory. Is it not evident, that if many souls go directly to heaven, that does not militate against the doctrine of purgatory Because some souls should go directly to heaven, it would be foolish in the extreme to argue that no such place as purgatory existed. I challenge Mr. Pope to produce a single direct proof from scripture against purgatory Every passage which he has quoted is perfectly consistent with the existence of a third place.

Before I proceed further, let me read to you the following passage from the pen of that candid Protestant divine, the learned Dr. Thorndyke, in his "Just Weights and Measures." Speaking of the doctrine promulgated by Luther, as to the justification by faith only, he says,—

"Can it fall within the sense of a Christian to imagine, that he can be restored by a 'Lord have mercy on me?' No, it must cost him hot tears and sighs, and groans, and extraordinary prayers, with fasting and alms. Those who assure sinners of pardon and the favour of God, with such means of true repentance, whether it be themselves, or their false teachers, plainly murder their souls."

Is not that a strong passage against the Lutheran and Calvinistic doctrine of justification by faith *only*, which has been adopted by Mr. Pope? The inutility of good works is a pleasing doctrine to promulgate;—it ministers to the passions of mankind, and encourages every species of immorality.

Mr. Pope talked of Job, and he stated that a Roman Catholic was astonished on his telling him that Job used the following words, while he was in this life:—

"Have pity on me, have pity on me, at least you my friends, because the hand of the Lord hath touched me."

I now assert that generally speaking, learned commentators agree, that Job there speaks in the spirit of prophecy of himself when dead, that his language related to Jesus Christ, whose death on the cross would redeem them, and that he therein solicited the prayers of the friends about him when he departed from this life. Such is the sense in which I find this passage understood by the learned commentators. But I had never quoted the text in support of the doctrine of purgatory, and Mr. Pope is therefore only building castles in the air, for the purpose of pulling them down. Is not the doctrine of Mr. Pope, on the head of justification by faith, directly Calvinistic? He has appeared afraid to express the opinion which he evidently entertains, that the blood of Christ is sufficient alone to save us; as if our Saviour himself had not annexed to the promise of salvation, many co-operating conditions, the fulfilment of which is necessary on the part of man—Hear what our Saviour says,

"But if thou wilt enter into heaven *keep the commandments.*"

"Unless you do penance you shall all likewise perish."—Matthew, xix. 17

I have already proved that the word μετανοια was used in reference to the repentance of the men of Nineveh, and that repentance we are told in scripture, consisted of the works of penance, fasting, and similar mortifications.

I defy any Protestant, who, like Mr. Pope, maintains the right of private judgment, to prove that the Bible is the inspired word of God. The Protestant must take it upon trust from the Catholic church. They receive the sacred scriptures from a church whose authority they refuse to acknowledge.

Mr. Pope has again recurred to the origin of the present discussion, and repeated that the passage in the speech published in the Register, first gave occasion to it. Mr. Pope has spoken too of that paper being the organ of the Catholic body—that may be true,—but I will here say that the editor of the Register had nothing to do with the speech in question. He should not be held responsible for it, unless it had been given in by the gentleman who furnishes the regular reports for that journal I have already disclaimed the accuracy of the report in question. I have on the first day, stated to this assembly, how Mr. Pope's challenge was sent round in green bags through my parish, and that a copy of it was served regularly upon me at breakfast after mass in the presence of several Protestants. Let Mr. Pope employ what arguments he may think fit against my creed. I shall not descend to personalities—even if he make a parcel of crabs crawl across this table, and state that they are souls on their journey to purgatory. I shall not accuse him of personality. Mr. Pope forsooth has made a noble discovery. He proves from a passage taken from the sixth book of Virgil's Æneid, that the Catholic church has stolen the idea of purgatory from the pagan mythology. Virgil likewise speaks of hell. Will Mr. Pope say that the doctrine of hell has been also stolen from the mythology of the heathens? I think I may make him a full present of the notable argument which he has founded upon the sixth book of the Æneid.

Mr. Pope says, that he cannot conceive how the fire of purgatory can act upon immaterial souls. This was precisely the objection started by Voltaire against the doctrine of hell—namely that fire could not act upon the human soul. That celebrated infidel, therefore, contended that the soul must be annihilated after its separation from the body; and he ridiculed as inconsistent and absurd, the doctrine of future rewards and punishments. The shade of Voltaire will, no doubt, feel extremely obliged to Mr. Pope.

Mr. Pope eternally recurs to the merits of the Redeemer's blood, in order to throw dust in the eyes of his hearers. There is not a man on earth places more dependance than I do upon

the sacred blood of our divine Redeemer. I feel that my eternal salvation is a doubtful matter, but I hold, with the Catholic church, that the merits of Christ's blood have out-balanced all sin. I believe that millions will be blessed in the Redeemer's name. Mr. Pope insists that the doctrine of the utility of good works detracts from the merits of Christ's sacrifice. It remains for Mr. Pope to show that *sin is sanctioned by heaven*: or that because good works are rewarded by our Saviour, he therefore derogates from his own infinite merits. We believe that all men who are saved are saved alone through the merits of Christ. As it is not derogatory to Christ to be an intercessor with the Father, neither is it derogatory to Christ to have intercessors under him. Mr. Pope's attempt to throw discredit upon the holy Fathers does not look well for his cause. I beg you to recollect the argument which I proposed respecting the Fathers—and which argument, as Mr. Pope has not condescended to notice it, I shall here repeat—either the Fathers in their writings published what was the acknowledged doctrine of the church or they did not. If they did publish the established doctrine of the church, Mr. Pope must give up the first ages of Christianity, and the first councils, and admit that there never was a period when such doctrine was not taught by the church. If the doctrines promulgated by the Fathers were not those entertained by the church, why did not the church then disclaim them, and condemn their opinions? Why did not the heretics quote the Fathers, as opposed to the Catholic church? Mr. Pope has given some quotations from the Fathers. As soon as the substance of the present controversy is drawn up and duly authenticated, I shall repair to the library at Manchester, and there examine the genuine editions of the Fathers, in order to ascertain the authenticity and correctness of the quotations read by Mr. Pope. The quotations which he has given are taken upon second hand authority. He has had them, I believe *obstetricante manu*.

My quotations remain uncontroverted and incontrovertible. I would recall the attention of all candid Protestants present to this fact, that I have proved my doctrine by three distinct passages from scripture, which have not been explained by my opponent—I have quoted Fathers who adduce the same texts of scripture in support of the doctrine of purgatory. Were Jerome, Augustine, Cyprian, Tertullian, and Origen, down to the fifth century, all wrong in their opinions on this subject? Will you prefer the private judgment of Mr. Pope before the unanimous consent of the holy Fathers and the authority of the church?

Dr. Johnson, one of the greatest men that England ever saw, admitted the reasonableness of the doctrine of purgatory. He acknowledged that it was a holy and reasonable doctrine, and he

accordingly offered up prayers for the departed soul of his mother. What Dr. Johnson held and acknowledged, few Protestants need be ashamed of.

Negative proofs alone were those to which Mr. Pope has had recourse. I have advanced no position in proof of the doctrine of purgatory, which I have not founded upon at least two direct and positive texts of scripture. I have also brought forward the holy Fathers in support of the doctrine which I maintain. I have proved that all antiquity concurred in giving the same meaning which I now give, to the texts of scripture which I have quoted. It must be acknowledged, even by Protestants, that those holy Fathers, who lived immediately after the Apostles, and many of whom are canonized saints, form a great and powerful authority, as to the doctrines of the church in the early ages of Christianity. Mr. Pope will not admit the authority of the church, nor will he give credit to the collective wisdom of the holy Fathers.

We read, that God will render to every man according to his works. If God plunges a man, for an idle word, into hell for all eternity, where will a place be found for Antichrist, or for Nero, Caligula, Domitian, and the other monsters of vice who have disgraced the human form? Where is a place of adequate punishment to be found for them, if a man be condemned everlastingly for the expression of a single idle word? Yet we read in St. John the words of our Lord, that

"Unless a man be born again of water, and the Holy Ghost, he shall not enter the kingdom of heaven."

Is the doctrine propounded by Mr. Pope consistent with the justice and mercy of God? Protestants should beware of the doctrine that asserts they must go directly and at once either to heaven or hell. The alternative is a dreadful one, and obviously does not consist with the goodness and mercy of God.

It is evident that the texts of Scripture are on my side. Has Mr. Pope quoted a single text directly against the doctrine which I advocate, or in contradiction to the texts which I have read to you? Weigh that fact in your minds.

Mr. Pope has attempted to cast discredit upon the utility of good works. Now I ask him, *how can a merciful God punish me eternally, for bad works, if he will give me no credit for my good ones?* I had been led to believe that the giving of even a cup of cold water should have its reward. I have already stated that good works avail not *per se*, but through the infinite merits of our Redeemer, who will reward the efforts of poor man, to co-operate with divine grace, in the atonement for his manifest transgressions.

Mr. Pope—As to the sermon which my learned opponent accuses me of preaching, it originated from the fact, that there were no arguments to which I had to reply. He has, indeed, dealt in broad assertions, but not in argument, Mr. Maguire has much objected to the expression, "judicial blindness." He should remember, that the constitution of the mind is framed by the God of mind. When we habitually resist the convictions of our judgments, the darkness of the understanding is increased, so that at length we cannot discover truth from falsehood: this is judicial blindness. *If it be the fact that so few go to purgatory, as Mr. Maguire asserts, then I hope that the number of masses for souls suffering in purgatory will be in proportion diminished.* I brought forward the passage from Job, as equalling in irrelevancy, Mr. Maguire's quotation from 2 Cor. i, 11. My opponent has asserted, that we are indebted for the holy scriptures to the church of Rome. I deny the position. Were there not various churches beside the church of Rome? Has my friend never heard of the Greek, the Abyssinian, the Chaldean, the Syrian, or the Waldensian churches? These all possessed the scriptures. To employ an illustration, which I have used on other occasions. If I desired a draught of water, and six or seven streams flowing towards me, should go and plunge my vessel into the nearest stream, I may be thus addressed by the proprietor of one of the rivulets:—"Sir, you are entirely dependant on me for water but you shall not draw it from this stream; it belongs to me." I might reply, "I am not exclusively indebted to you or dependant upon your fountain: there are five or six other streams at hand; you may, if you please, debar me of access to your well, but I can put my bucket into other springs, and take a refreshing draught."

Mr. Maguire remarks, that my observation on the incompetency of material fire to purge an immaterial spirit, coincides with that of Voltaire. I hold, that although a spirit cannot suffer from material substance, it can be taught to suffer by being brought into contact with spirit. When the spirit is re-united to the corporeal frame, then the body may suffer from material fire. My opponent says, that the Fathers in the quotations, which he adduced relative to purgatory, either gave the mind of the church or they did not: if they did not, why did not the church protest against them: if they did give the mind of the church, why is not the doctrine which he says they propound, received? In reply, I say, that the quotations from the Fathers, which I have adduced in *refutation* of purgatory, either gave the mind of the church, or they did not: if they did not, why were they not protested against; if they did, why is not the doctrine received which they support? Therefore, we have Fathers against Fathers.

My opponent asked questions in the last half hour yesterday when he knew they could not be replied to. He has said that I have not given my rule of faith. I beg to be permitted to deny this assertion. I again and again stated, that THE BIBLE IS MY RULE OF FAITH. I never asserted that God suffered. Christ suffered not in his divinity, but in his human nature: and the union of deity with manhood, stamped an infinite value upon his sufferings. I shall now proceed to prove the inspiration, canonicity, integrity, authenticity, and genuineness of the sacred volume. From the short time allowed, I shall be under the necessity of condensing my remarks within a small compass. I would first ask, how does the church of Rome decide upon these questions? Is it by inspiration? My opponent, I am convinced, does not entertain such an opinion. It is then ON EVIDENCE; AND IS NOT EVIDENCE TANGIBLE TO OTHERS AS WELL AS TO THE CHURCH OF ROME? My friend has made an observation to this effect, that I disregarded aggregate wisdom. The assertion, permit me to say, is unfounded. I deny not, that in the multitude of counsellors there is safety. Surely the wisdom of a collective body may be serviceable, though not endowed with the prerogative of infallibility.—As to the inspiration of the system, revealed in scripture; all are convinced that we need a revelation. The light of nature can in no wise discover to us a plan, by which the Deity, in perfect harmony with his unchanging perfections, can pardon guilty man. Socrates looked for such a revelation. The law of opinion is continually fluctuating, and does not furnish an immutable standard of morals. Do we not want something to cheer and console us amidst the vicissitudes and troubles of life? When we look beyond the portals of the grave, do we not require a ray of truth to illuminate the darkness of the tomb? By nature we know little of God, little of ourselves, little of our destinies. Here is a volume which purports to be a revelation from heaven. I study it, and find in it a sublime display of the divine perfections, a scheme of redemption perfectly adapted to my circumstances, a perfect code of morals, a system whose tendency is to diffuse happiness on earth, and to smooth the rugged brow of death; so that the volume bears upon its very front the broad impress of heaven. I find that it has condensed the fragments of truth that are scattered through the world, into a glorious whole. I find that it explains the mazes and labyrinths of life, and brings glory to God in the highest, and speaks peace on earth, good will towards men. Its two great divisions, the Old and New Testament, contain prophecies which have been fulfilled in the destruction of kingdoms, and in events which history has recorded. The Jews are scattered throughout the world, and are still a distinct people. Lord

Chesterfield, with all his infidelity was obliged to say, that he never could get over the state of the Jews as a testimony to the truth of scripture. From what origin could such a system have sprung? It could never have emanated from the schools of antiquity. The schools were incapable of discovering the character of God, or of devising such a scheme of morals. Ancient philosophers were, comparatively, children on the subject of moral obligation. If philosophy could not impart such truth, we must look to some other source, and I find—that source is heaven. What object, I would ask, could the Apostles have had in attempting to deceive mankind? Was it temporal interest? No—they exposed themselves to persecution and death. When, therefore, I find the system which they have revealed, according with the voice of nature, adapted to the circumstances of man, accurately describing his character, and palpably embodying in itself the attributes of Jehovah, I cannot avoid asking,

> "Whence, but from heaven, should men unskilled in arts,
> In different ages born, in different parts,
> Weave such agreeing truths, or how, or why,
> Should all conspire to cheat us with a lie,
> Unasked their pains, ungrateful their advice,
> Starving their gains, and martyrdom their price?"—DRYDEN.

Having made these observations on the inspiration of the system contained in the sacred records, I beg to remark, that the man convinced that the system is divine, does not experience much difficulty respecting the canon of scripture. The illiterate person never troubles himself upon the subject. He finds a balm for his sorrows in the word of life—a medicine for his soul, drawn from the laboratory of truth, prepared by the great Physician of Souls. As to the canonicity of the sacred volume: what is the evidence respecting any work, such as Virgil or Horace, but the testimony of the ancients? This testimony is infinitely more conclusive in support of the sacred scriptures. We shall commence with the fourth century, (it being unnecessary to begin with the writers of a later period) and take you through successive witnesses up to the first century, when we have the five Apostolic Fathers. Allow me to trespass upon your attention by mentioning the names of some of the writers. In the *fourth* century, we have numerous quotations from the New Testament in the writings of St. Athanasius, Ephiphanius, Jerome, Rufinus, Augustin, Eusebius, and Cyril, Gregory Nazienzen, Philaster, Arnobius, Lactantius, and others. In the *third* century, we find various passages from the New Testament, occurring in the writings of Novatus, Dionysius, Commodian, Anatolius, Theognostus, Methodius, Phileas, Victorinus,

Cyprian, Caius, and others. In the *second* century, Tertullian Clemens Alexandrinus, Theophilus of Antioch, Athenagoras Irenæus of Lyons, Melito, Tatian, Hegesippus, Justin Martyr and Papias, contain numerous references to the New Testament. This chain of evidence brings us to the five Apostolic Fathers: Barnabas, Clemens, Romanus, Hermas, Ignatius and Polycarp. In the fourth century we have catalogues of the books of the New Testament made by St. Athanasius, (39 Ep. Fest. t. i, p. 961, E. 962, C.) Jerome, (De Stud. Script. ad Paul in. ep. 50, al. 103, t. iv, p. 2, p. 574, ed. Bened.) Rufinus, (Expos. Symb. Apost.) Augustin, (De Doctr. Christ. l. 2, cap. viii, n. 12, 13, 14, tom. iii, p. 1, Benedict.) and Epiphanius, (Panar. h. 76, p. 941.) most accurately agreeing with the present received canon.

If this evidence be sufficient to satisfy every candid man, as to the canonicity of the books of the New Testament, that portion of the sacred oracles will enable us to conclude respecting the canonicity of the books of the Old. Almost all the books of the Old Testament are quoted in the New, as may be seen by consulting the short appendix to Canne's Bible. The Jews, as I have already stated, did not receive the apocrypha. The passage to that effect from Bellarmine, is as follows:

"Omnes libros quos Protestantes non recipiunt," &c.

"All the books which the Protestants do not receive, the Jews also do not admit."—Lib. i, De verb. Dei. c. 10, principio et sect ad locum.

In the beginning of the sixteenth century, the Compultenstian Polyglot was published by Ximenes, Cardinal and Archbishop of Toledo, in Spain. In the preface to the reader, there is a special admonition given, that the books of Tobit, Judith, Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus and the Maccabees, with the additions to Esther, which *are set forth in the Greek only*, are not canonical scripture. The words are these—

"But the books *without* the canon, which the church receives rather for the edification of the people, than for confirming the authority of ecclesiastica. dogmas, are given in Greek only, but with a double interpretation."

About this time, the Vulgate Bible with Lira's commentary and the ordinary gloss, was printed at Basil; in the preface we read as follows:

"Since there are many, who because they do not bestow attention upon the sacred scriptures, suppose that all the books which are contained in the Bible, are to be venerated with like respect, not knowing how to distinguish between canonical and uncanonical books, (which the Jews reckon amongst the apocrypha) from whence they often appear ridiculous to the learned, therefore, we have distinguished and distinctly enumerated, first, the canonical books, and afterwards the uncanonical; between which there is as much difference, as between that which is certain and that which is dubious; for the canonical books were composed by the dictation of the Holy Spirit, but *it is not known at what time, or by what authors the uncanonical, or in the words the apocry*

what books were set forth; but the canonical books are of so great authority that whatsoever is there contained, the church holds as true, firmly and without question."

Permit me to add, that the Redeemer, who pointedly censured the Jews for making void the word of God by their traditions, would still have strongly condemned them, if they had left out of their canon any part of the word of God.

With respect to the uncorrupted preservation of the Old Testament, let us bear in mind the great care with which the Jews preserved it. Philo Judæus informs us, that the Jews regarded the Old Testament with such profound veneration, that they even counted the letters, that they discarded a copy which contained a single error, and would rather lose their lives than alter the original in the slightest degree.—(Philo. ap. Euseb. de. Præp. Evang. lib. viii, c. 2.) How could the Old Testament have been adulterated previously to the Saviour? The Jews were divided into sects. The Talmudists and the Caraites would naturally watch over their common scripture with jealousy. Could the Samaritans have been prevailed upon to unite with the Jews in corrupting the Pentateuch? After the commencement of the Christian era, the Old Testament was in the hands of Christians as well as Jews. Had the Jews left out any portion of the Old Testament, would they not have omitted the passages which condemned the conduct of their leaders, which speak of the idolatries of the people as sanctioned by their priesthood, and which predict their treatment of the Messiah? but these are still found in the Old Testament. The quotations from the Old Testament in the Fathers coincide with the same passages as they stand in our Bible: from this fact also we infer, that the Old Testament has not been corrupted since their time. The New Testament has been dispersed in different countries. The variety of sects which have existed, watched it with such jealous care, that none could have mutilated it. We have many ancient translations. Drs. Kennicott and Bentley have examined numberless manuscripts, both of the Old and New Testament. Dr. Bentley, speaking of *the various readings*, says,

"I, for my part, and, as I believe, many others, would not lament, if but of the old MSS. yet untouched, 10,000 more were faithfully collected: some of which, without question, would render the text more beautiful, just and exact; though of no consequence to the main of religion nay, perhaps, wholly synonymous in the view of common readers, and quite *insensible* in any modern version."—Philaleuth. Lipsieus. p. 90.

These are proofs which must satisfy every candid inquirer, as to the canonicity and uncorrupted preservation of the sacred volume.

I pass on rapidly to my proofs of the authenticity of scripture. The primitive Christian Fathers, and others were competent

judges as to matters of fact. And can we believe, that so many would have deserted the schools of philosophy, enrolled themselves amongst the persecuted disciples of Jesus Christ, and have suffered martyrdom itself, if they had not been convinced, upon sound evidence, of the authenticity of the facts recorded in the inspired volume? With respect to the genuineness of the New Testament: contrast the several books; mark the coincidence between the history of the writers and their respective writings; observe the style of each—the gospel of St. Luke is of purer Greek than the others—this circumstance is accounted for by the fact, that Luke was a physician, and consequently possessed, it is presumed, some share of learning. We have many Hebraisms and Syriacisms in the New Testament, by which we know that the writers were Jews; for their thoughts being transfused into Greek, the diction contracted a tincture from the medium through which they passed. On the other hand, but few of the Fathers knew any thing of Hebrew.

Allow me here to remark, that in thus appealing to the mere evidence of historical testimony—I am not departing from my principles. The "modus tradendi," *the mode of handing down*, and the "res tradita," *the thing handed down*, are altogether different. Cardinal Bellarmine mentions the evidences by which a book is known to be canonical, "first, from the testimonials of the ancients—secondly, from its likeness and agreement with the other books—thirdly, from the common sense and taste of Christian people."—De Verb. Dei. l. c. 10.

"He that is spiritual judgeth things," says the Apostle Paul, 1 Cor. ii, 15. Let the man of a spiritual mind, read the apocrypha, and his taste and feeling will nauseate much that is contained therein; nor will he find the same spirit in them which pervades the books of holy writ.

Fourth Day.—Monday, April 23.

SUBJECT.—"*The Justification of the Reformation*"

Admiral Oliver and Christopher Fitzsimon, Esq., in the chair.

Mr. Maguire rose, and called on Mr. Pope to justify the Reformers.

Mr. Pope.—Mr. Maguire has called upon me for a justification of the *Reformers*: but permit me to remind you, gentlemen

that I stand up on the present occasion to justify the separation from the Church of Rome which took place at the commencement of the 16th century. I wish it to be distinctly understood that I stand not here to vindicate every act of the reformers: it is the separation from the church of Rome which I am to justify. If I were for a moment to admit (which I *by no means* do) that the reformers were the most abandoned characters upon earth—if, for argument's sake, I were to make this concession, it would not interfere with the question before us, which is—were the reformers justified in separating from the church of Rome in the 16th century? The reformers, 'tis true, had their failings like other men; but this is to be accounted for, partly from the natural weakness of human nature, and partly from the influence of the system which they had just abandoned. It is difficult for a person, long accustomed to habits of indolence and profligacy, instantaneously to engage in the activities of life—at once to shake off the chrysalis, and stand forth in all the beauty and proportion of moral rectitude. Suppose that you had been confined in a gloomy dungeon for twenty or thirty years; when first you are led forth to enjoy the light and liberty of heaven, is it not natural to think, that you could not for some time enjoy the perfect exercise of your visual organs?

I would justify the separation from the church of Rome upon two grounds: the first is, THE DEGRADED MORAL CHARACTER OF THE CHURCH OF ROME at the time of the Reformation; and the second is, THE UNSCRIPTURAL NATURE OF THE PECULIAR DOCTRINES OF THAT CHURCH. As to the moral character of the church of Rome, I might only refer you to the quotations which I have already adduced; but to these I beg to add some others. You will bear in mind that they are the testimonies of *Roman Catholic writers.*

Cardinal Baronius says, in the close of the 10th century:—

"What then was the face of the Roman church? How very filthy, when the most powerful and sordid harlots then ruled at Rome, at whose pleasure, sees were changed, and bishoprics were given, and—which is horrible to hear, and most abominable—their *gallants* were obtruded into the see of Peter, and made FALSE POPES; for who can say they could be lawful Popes, who were obtruded by such harlots without law? There was no mention of the election or consent of clergy; the canons were silent, the decrees of Popes suppressed, the ancient traditions proscribed,—lust, armed with the secular power, challenged all things to itself.— * * * * * * *

* * * * * * * * * * *

What kind of Cardinals, do you imagine, must be then chosen by those monsters, when nothing is so natural as for like to beget like? who can doubt, but they in all things did consent to those that chose them? Who will not easily believe that they animated them and followed their footsteps? Who understands not that such men must wish that our Lord would have slept continually, and never have awoke to judgement to take cognizance of or punish their iniquities."—Annal. Tom. x, A. D. 912, Art. 8.

Of the 11th century Baronius writes,—

"That it was by Dithmarus styled the iron age, because iniquity did then abound, and that many did then discourse and believe, that in this very age antichrist was to come, and the world was to have an end: and the corruption of manners which then (saith he) was very great, especially *among the ecclesiastics*, might easily persuade men that it would be so."—A. D. 1001.

In the 16th century, in the council of Lateran, under Julian the Second, it is declared that,

"Oppression, rapine, adultery, incest, and all pestilent vices, did confound all sacred and profane things, and that the same beat St. Peter's ship so impetuously, that it was almost drowned."

"What may we think," said Platina, "will become of our age, wherein our sins are grown so great, that they have scarce left us any room with God to obtain mercy. How great the covetousness of the priests is, and especially of such as rule among them; how great the lusts of all sects: what ambition, pomp, pride, what ignorance both of themselves, and Christian doctrine, what little religion, and that but hypocritical rather than true, what corrupt manners to be detested even in lay people, I need not say; when they sin so openly and publicly, as if they sought for commendation thereby."

Nicolaus de Clemangis, an archdeacon in the church of Rome in the 15th century, in his epistle, where he speaks of flying not only with our minds from Babylon but with our bodies also, writes thus—

"Who can there safely live, where not only wicked things are lawful, but all men are compelled by the severest punishments to believe, speak, and follow the most wicked and ungodly things; and to embrace them as things just and laudable; where they do not only *not receive sound doctrine*, but bitterly persecute all those who do resist the madness of their wills? * * What is it, think you, to be drunk with the cup of Babylon, but from long conversation with her to be so infected with the contagion of her, that following the erring herd, you willingly embrace false things for true; perverse, for righteous, mad things for sound: and to desire rather to be mad with the multitude, than to be wise alone with danger and derision? He that is different in manners from them, ought not to live there, where the plague of corruption hath so prevailed as to infect all men with its contagion."—P. 177.

In his book of *Simoniacal Prelates*, he says, cap. 1:—

"The church is now become a shop of merchandise, or rather of robbery and rapine; in which all the sacraments are exposed to sale. * * And, therefore, you see such men admitted to the priesthood and other holy orders, who are idiots, unlearned, and scarce able to read, though waywardly, and without understanding one syllable after another, who know no more of Latin, than they do of Arabic, who, when they read, pray, or sing, know not whether they bless God, or blaspheme him—men undisciplined, unquiet, gluttons, drunkards, praters, vagabonds, lustful, bred up in luxury, and in one word idle, and ignorant."

I will not shock your ears by reading the passage which follows. In his book of *The Corrupt State of the Church*, cap. iii, he tells us,

"That she was defiled with the sink of all vices; and might be fitly called *the Church of Malignants*: that the saying of the prophet was now verified *that from the least of them to the greatest every one was given to covetousness*,

that from the prophet to the priest every one dealt falsely. * * * * * preaches or declares the gospel? Who, either by word or deed, shows the way to life eternal ?"

Speaking of the Pope, he says—

"That by taking from the diocesans and patrons the liberty of presentation to their benefices, he had stocked the church with ignorant and wicked men. How great a number of expectants from that time came in, not from their studies or the schools, but from the plough and servile arts, to become parish priests, and obtain other benefices, who knew little more of the Latin, than the Arabic tongue; who could not read, and, which is a shame to speak of, *scarce knew A from B, and yet their immorality was greater than their ignorance;* for, being educated in idleness, without learning, they followed nothing but idleness, sports, banquetings, brawlings and vain talk: hence is it, that in all places we have so many ignorant, miserable, and wicked priests."—Cap. 13.

In the next place, he taxes the cardinals with avarice, uncleanness, simony, and other vices. He says,

"That by their means it came to pass, that no man learned in the scriptures; no honest, just, and virtuous persons were advanced to high dignities; but only ambitious persons, flatterers, buffoons, and men corrupted with all vices; so that they were wholly unlearned, or if they knew something of the imperial laws, or gainful sciences, they never thought of God's law, or of the spiritual learning, in which the people were to be instructed to life eternal—that if any person happened to condemn their covetousness and injustice, if he endeavoured by wholesome exhortations, and by preaching to gain souls, if he meditated more on the laws of God, than those of men, presently every man's teeth were whet against him, and ready to bite him; and they proclaimed him a fool, and one unworthy of the priesthood. So that now, (saith he) the study of the scriptures, and the professor of divinity are become ridiculous to all men."

Of the Bishops:

"That in most dioceses, the rectors or the parish priests paid them a certain price for keeping * * * * * * *. That no man was admitted into the clergy or sacred orders, or any ecclesiastical degree, without rewards, which, saith he, is intolerable; that being youths without beards, and scarce got from under the ferula, they obtained a bishopric, knowing as little of that office, as of the mariner's vocation; that by their filthy examples they led their flocks into bye ways, which tended to their ruin."—Cap. 11, 12, 13.

Again,

"What should I speak, (saith he) of the learning of the priests, when it is visible that scarce any of them can read? they know not words, and much less things: he of them that prayeth, is a barbarian to himself. If any man is idle and abhors labour, if he loves luxury, he gets now a days into the clergy, and then presently he joins himself to the rest of the priests that are voluptuous, and live according to Epicurus, rather than according to the laws of Christ."—Cap. 25.

"Such (saith he) is the abundance of wicked men in all professions, that there is scarcely one among a thousand, who sincerely doth what his profession doth require; if there be any sincere, chaste, sober, frugal person, in any college or convent, who doth not walk in the broad way, he is made a ridiculous fable to the rest, and is continually called an insolent, mad, and hypocritical fellow; so that many who would have been good, had they lived with good and honest men, are drawn by wicked company into their vices, lest they should suffer the fore-mentioned reproaches among their companions."—Cap. 26.

He then concludes with an apostrophe to the Roman church—

"What thinkest thou of thine own prophecy, the revelations of St. John? dost thou not think they do at least, in part, belong to thee; thou hast not surely so wholly lost all shame as to deny this; look, therefore, into it, and *read the damnation of the great whore sitting upon many waters, and there contemplate thy famous facts, and future ruin.*"—Declarat. defect. Virorum Eccless.

James de Paradise, of Chartres, who wrote a little after the Council of Basil, says,

They who have the presidency in councils on the Pope's behalf, when they see that matters in the council make against their masters and them, what can be expected from them but that they will *withstand* the decrees of such councils with might and main, either by *dissolving* them, or *sowing dissensions* in them; and so *the thing* shall remain *unfinished*, and we be driven to return to *the old wilderness of error and of ignorance.* Every body knows this to be *most true*, unless it be some one *happily* who is *not experienced* in times past. The *tragedy* which was acted in our age in the *council of Basil* doth sufficiently prove it, as they knew well who have laid down the story before our eyes.—De Sept. stat. Ecclesiæ. 1.

Of the 16th century, in which the council of Trent was held, and more particularly of the proceedings there, the complaints are still more grievous.

"Amongst most of the primates of our religion, whose example the ignorant people ought to follow and be conformed to, there is," saith Picus Mirandula, "either none, or very little service of God, no good life, no shame, no modesty. Justice is declined into hatred or favour, piety is almost turned into superstition, and by all orders of men sin is so openly committed, that very often the virtue of the honest man is made his crime, and vice is honoured as a virtue by them who think the unheard of petulancy and long impunity of their vices to be as walls and enclosures to them."—Orat. ad Loen. X, et Concil Lat. habit. A. D. 1512, Oper. t. xx, p. 1826.

Stæphylus, speaking of the destruction of the city of Rome, which happened A. D. 1527, observes—

"Whence is it that this happened? *to wit, because* all flesh had corrupted its ways, we were all citizens and inhabitants not of the holy city of Rome, but of Babylon, that wicked city; of which that of the prophet Isaiah is fulfilled, 'How is the faithful city become an harlot.' Let no man think this prophecy hath been fulfilled already, in the destruction of Babylon or of Jerusalem. No! future things were present to the prophet's eye, and this the prophet hath declared to us, saying, 'the daughter of Zion shall be left desolate, as in the wasting of the enemy.' St. John doth in the Revelations tell us, the daughter of Zion is not Jerusalem but Rome; and his description of her makes it plain. 'For the woman which thou sawest (saith he) is *that great city* which hath dominion over the kings of the earth,' that is spiritual dominion. She sits, saith he upon seven hills, which *properly agrees to Rome*, which, upon this account, is styled Septicollis. She is full, saith he, of the names of blasphemy —she is the mother of uncleanness, fornications, and abominations, which are in the earth; than which words *no more particular demonstration of the city can be requisite*, seeing these iniquities do almost generally reign, yet here they have their seat and empire. Orat. habit. ad auditores Rotæ Maii 15, A. D.

I might adduce many other quotations, but I shall bring forward only two more. Johannes de Eych, Episcopus Eystatensis, speaking of the corruption of the times of the Reformation, says

"The perverted manners by which almost all the ecclesiastical order is stained, so cloud the senses of all, that not only they do not perceive the word of truth with their ears, but even despising amendment of life, they resist their own salvation even with arms."—Prima Epistola, P. M. 2.

Franciscus de Victoria, observes, that,

"The Church could neither bear her disorders nor their remedies."—Ecclesia nec mala sua, nec remedia, ferre posse.—Prelect 4, prop. 23.

In addition to these testimonies from Roman Catholic authorities, I beg leave to observe, that at the time of the Reformation as my friend is well aware, there was an UNIVERSAL CRY FOR A REFORMATION OF ABUSES.

I am now come to my second point, namely, the unscriptural nature of the peculiar doctrines of the church of Rome.

First, as to Tradition.—

[Here Mr. Maguire interrupted Mr. Pope. I came here to defend three points of my religious creed. I attack but three of your's. I will not allow you to go into others.

Mr. POPE replied, that the question before them was the justification of the Reformation; and in order to justify it, it was necessary for him to enter briefly into the doctrines of the church of Rome.

Mr. MAGUIRE. You should defend yourself, and not attack me. I appeal to the written regulations.

Mr. POPE. I stand on my defence, and am to show that the reformers were justified in separating from the church of Rome: from the state of that church, both with regard to *morals and doctrine.*

Mr. MAGUIRE appealed to the chair: and after a consultation. Mr. Lawless stated the opinion of the chair, namely, that Mr. Pope had a right to state whatever reasons occurred to his judgment, as having called for the Reformation, and on the other hand that Mr. Maguire had a right to prove the scriptural character of the doctrines opposed, in order to show, that the Reformation was not called for on that account.]

Mr. POPE resumed.—Gentlemen, I shall take a rapid view of the doctrines of the church of Rome, in order to prove that the reformers were justified in separating from her communion on that ground.

TRADITION.

The church of Rome says—

"All saving truth not being contained in the holy scripture, but partly in the scripture, and partly in unwritten traditions; scripture and tradition are to be received and venerated with like piety and reverence, "pari pietatis affectu ac reverentia."—Concil Trident. Sess. 4, Decret. de can. Script.

The Douay Bible says—

"You shall not ADD to the word that I speak to you."—Deut. IV ch. 2.
"Every word of God is fire-tried; *add* not any thing to his words, lest thou be reproved and found a liar."—Prov. xxx ch. 5, 6.
"For I testify to every one that heareth the words of the prophecy of this book: If any man shall ADD to these things, God shall add unto him the plagues written in this book."—Apoc. xxii ch. 18.
"The holy scriptures *can instruct thee to salvation* by the faith which is in Christ Jesus: all scripture inspired of God, is profitable to teach, to remove to correct, to instruct in justice: that the man of God may be perfect, furnished to every good work."—2 Tim. iii ch. 15, 17.
"You have made void the commandment of God for your tradition."—Matt. xv ch. 6.

I find, therefore, that tradition is condemned, and that scripture is able "to instruct unto salvation, to teach, to reprove, to correct, and to instruct in justice, that the man of God may be perfect, furnished to every good work." I am desirous of knowing, if the scriptures be imperfect, by what process they can make a man *perfect in every good work?*

READING THE SCRIPTURES.

The church of Rome intimate, that it is not for the people to read the sacred scriptures—Indiscriminata lectio sacræ scripturæ interdicte est—and her practice abundantly confirms the information. Conc. Trid. Sess. 4, Decret. de can. Scrip: Ind. lib. prohib. Reg. 4.

The Douay Bible says—

"Come near, ye Gentiles, and hear, and hearken ye *people:* let the earth hear, and all that is therein; the world, and every thing that cometh forth of it."—Isaiah, xxxiv, 1.

And adds in the 16th verse—

"SEARCH YE DILIGENTLY IN THE BOOK OF THE LORD AND READ."
"Search the scriptures."—John, v, 39.

Our next subject is

PRIVATE JUDGMENT.

Certainly my friend has thrown new light on the extent to which the church of Rome permits the exercise of private judgment: however, I cannot avoid thinking, that the doctrine of the church is in substance this—believe implicitly what the church tells you.

The Douay Bible says,

"PROVE ALL things; hold fast that which is good."—1 Thess. v, 21.
"*Try* the spirits, if they be of God."—1 John, iv, 1.

IMAGE WORSHIP.

"*It is lawful to express any person of the most holy Trinity by certain signs* none being so rude as to think that the divinity is expressed by that image But let the pastors teach that by them are declared some properties or actions which are attributed to God. The images and relics of Christ and the saints

are to be duly honoured and venerated; and in this veneration, those are venerated which are represented by them."—Trent Catech. part iii, ch. 2, p 302, Dub. 1816. Conc. Trid. Sess. 25, de Invocat.

The Douay Bible says—

"Thou shalt not make to thyself any graven thing, nor the likeness of any thing that is in heaven above, or in the earth beneath, nor of those things that are in the waters under the earth; thou shalt not adore them nor serve them."—Exod. xx, 4, 5: See Deut. iv, 15, 16. Acts, xvii, 29.

All I ask the church of Rome to do is this—to write the 2nd commandment under every image and picture, which are objects of worship; and the common sense of the votaries of the church of Rome will rise up and declare, that such a practice is directly opposed to the Word of God.

MEDIATORS.

The church of Rome says,

"There are other mediators of intercession in heaven besides Jesus Christ; such as angels and saints and especially, the Virgin Mary, who is the mother of mercy and advocatress of the faithful; and it is good and profitable to invoke them, and to have recourse to their prayers and help."—Conc. Tid. Sess. 25, de Invocat. &c.

The Douay Bible says—

"Jesus saith to him, I am the truth and the life; no man cometh to the Father but by me."—John, xiv, 6, see 13th verse.

"There is ONE Mediator of God and man, the man Christ Jesus."—1 Tim. ii, 5.

"Jesus is able also to save for ever them that come to God by him, always living to make intercession for us."—Hebrews, vii, 25.

We have already had the subject of purgatory brought before us; and I am inclined to think, that some who believed implicitly in that doctrine, are shaken in the implicit character of their faith in it.

GOOD WORKS.

A canon of the church of Rome, quoted on a former day, may be thus condensed—

"The good works of justified persons are truly and properly meritorious and duly worthy of eternal life."—Conc. Trid. Sess. 6, cap. 16, can. 32.

The Douay Bible says,

"By grace you are saved through faith, and that not of yourselves, for it is the gift of God; *not of works*, that no man may glory."—Eph. ii ch. 8.

"The wages of sin is death, but the grace of God life everlasting in Christ Jesus our Lord."

Or more plainly,

"The *gift of God* is eternal life, through Jesus Christ our Lord."—Rom. vi, 23.

"When you have done *all* things that are commanded you, say: we are *unprofitable* servants; we have done that which we ought to do."—Luke xvii, 10.

I need not now speak on transubstantiation—that will be our subject of discussion to-morrow, you will then see that that doctrine can obtain no support from Holy Writ.

I pray you to judge from this brief contrast, between the doctrines of the church of Rome and those of the Bible, whether the reformers were not called upon to separate from such a communion.

But my quarrel with the church of Rome, like that of the reformers, is touching that grand tenet which she has laboured to set aside, justification by faith—acceptance at the bar of God in dependance solely on the atoning blood of the Saviour. I trace up the principal errors of the church of Rome to ignorance or rejection of this fundamental article of the Christian religion. Would she, for instance, hold that good works entitle to eternal life, if she believed that "by the deeds of the law no flesh could be justified," (Rom. iii, 20,) and that the sinner could be saved only by the obedience unto death of the Lord Jesus Christ? How could the church of Rome maintain the doctrine of supererogation, if she acknowledged that "every mouth is shut and the whole world brought in guilty before God," (Rom. iii, 19,) and that "cursed is every one that continueth not in all things written in the book of the law to do them?"—(Gal. iii, 10.) Did she believe the sacrifice of Christ to be an all-sufficient atonement, would she think a purgatorial fire necessary? If she knew that the blood of Christ cleanseth from *all* sin, would she hold that the soul stands in need of an additional purgation? Could she for a moment entertain the notion of repeating the sacrifice of Christ, if He were acknowledged by her as having made by "one oblation of himself once for all," an end of sin, reconciliation for iniquity, and as having brought in everlasting righteousness? This grand doctrine the reformers proclaimed, and for the maintaining of it they stood out from the church of Rome. Luther deemed it the "articulus stantis vel cadentis Ecclesiæ." and I say, let this doctrine be preached in all its fulness, and we shall plant a lever beneath the fortresses of Babylon; and soon shall we hear her sentence issuing from the throne of the Eternal, "Down with her, down with her, even to the ground."

Such are the reasons upon which I vindicate the Reformation. It is not my intention to justify every act of the reformers. If I should wish to recriminate, Mr. Maguire may be assured, that I have it in my power, in turn, to place in the most awful point of view, the characters of those who are recognized as the heads of the church of Rome. There is, however, this wide distinction—I do not acknowledge Luther as the head of my church: Christ, the Lord over all, is the head of his mystical body; I call no man master in the strict sense of the term, and therefore

am not bound to follow men only so far as they follow Christ, much less am I called upon to justify every act in the history of their lives. These are the two grounds, on which I would justify the separation from the church of Rome, which took place in the sixteenth Century :—first, *the moral condition of the church of Rome*—and secondly, *the unscriptural character of her doctrines*.

Mr. MAGUIRE.—Before I proceed further, I beg leave here to enter my solemn protest against the decision of the Chair, and the line of conduct which has been adopted towards me. I publicly and solemnly protest against it. It is an obvious and complete departure from the understanding and principles upon which this discussion was commenced. Before I came to Dublin, I had expressly agreed and stipulated with Mr. Pope, that he should select any three articles of the Catholic doctrine which he pleased, for attack—that I should select three points against him, and that we should thus act the parts of plaintiff and defendant reciprocally. I appeal to the candour of my Protestant auditors, if this were not the express stipulation upon the faith of which I agreed to meet Mr. Pope in this public controversial discussion. One of the points which I selected against Mr. Pope, was a justification of the Protestant Reformation. I admit he was free to bring forward every circumstance which he could consistently urge in defence of that schism. But is he, on this occasion, instead of confining himself to that single point, to level his attacks against all and every one of the doctrines of the Catholic church? Am I, in the short period allotted to me, expected to be able to defend all the doctrines of my church, and to repel all the calumnies and misrepresentations which Mr. Pope may bring forward against her. I can only say that my confidence has been abused—that I have been any thing but well treated. I shall, however, proceed to rebut the scandalous charges advanced by Mr. Pope, and which he has grounded upon the authority of Protestant historians exclusively, with the exception of Baronius and Bellarmine, and upon the testimony of historians, be it observed, deserving of little credit upon this particular subject. I must also remark that instead of there being only three points on each side for attack and defence, mutually, I have only three points at present, to urge against Mr. Pope, while he has put me on my defence for fifteen or twenty. Before I proceed to defend the articles of my creed against the rigmarole attack which has been levelled at them by my opponent, I shall advert to one or two facts which it may be as well for you to bear in memory.

Mr. Pope has not at all answered my arguments respecting the proofs of the authenticity, integrity, and inspiration of the

sacred scriptures. With regard to the Sixtine edition, I deny that but two copies of it are in existence. I have here the Sixtine and Clementine editions. A Roman Catholic clergyman of this city purchased a copy of it exposed publicly to sale in the city of Rome. I will admit that Clement did not wish that that edition of the Bible should be circulated. Orders had been given by the council of Trent that a pure and perfect edition of the Latin Vulgate, "quam emendatissime," should be prepared by learned men under the sanction of the sovereign pontiff. Many verbal corruptions were to be found in the edition then in common use, arising either from the neglect of the copyists, or from the ignorance of those who endeavoured to purify the text. Now Sixtus Quintus had previously taken upon him not only to make out a pure copy of the Bible, but to introduce changes from the original Hebrew and Greek editions, which, in the opinions of St. Jerome, St. Augustin, and Dr. Wall, a Protestant bishop, were not so pure as the old Latin and Italian translations. When Clement perused the edition of Sixtus, he ordered that it should be purified according to the ancient Latin and Italian translations. But I defy any man to point out a substantial difference between the Clementine and Sixtine editions. It is curious, too, that in the preface to the Sixtine edition, that preface from which Mr. Pope quoted with such triumph the phrase "*ne in minima particula*," it is pronounced lawful to make verbal amendments and corrections, but upon condition that they shall be introduced into the text, and not put in the margin, "*ad offensionem populi vitandam*,"—lest the people should be scandalized, not distinguishing between verbal and substantial alterations. The *ne in minima particula*, it is obvious relates to matters of faith.

Mr. Pope asserted that masses were said for the rich and not for the poor. I have the Missal here on the table, and by referring to it, Mr. Pope will find that mass is offered up for all the faithful, living and dead, without any reservation whatever. In the sacrifice of the mass we pray for all Christians, for all infidels, heretics, schismatics—nay, for Mr. Pope himself. The charge of taking money comes with a bad grace from the other side. There is a Protestant clergyman in this city, who is called chaplain to the Virgin Mary; his income amounts to £300 a year, and if the leases were out, it would average £3,000 per annum. This was bequeathed, some centuries ago, in order to have masses said for the departed; the masses are not said, but the Protestant parson pockets the money.

The important fact has been established of Mr. Pope's ignorance of the Bible. Though he has told us he has made the scriptures his continual study, and though he professed a thorough

acquaintance, both with the Protestant and Catholic versions, he acknowledged his ignorance on Saturday of the following text:

"And yet man knoweth not whether he be worthy of love or hatred."

I can inform him that it is to be found in the ninth chapter of Ecclesiastes. Between the Protestant and Catholic versions of this text, there is no substantial difference as it runs thus in the Protestant Bible—"No man knoweth either love or hatred, by all that is before him."—Mr. Pope talked of the Catholic church teaching that all truths are not contained in scripture. I have already proved, that all truths are not contained in the scriptures; and I challenge Mr. Pope to produce proofs from scripture for five articles of the Protestant creed. But I should recollect that he throws the Protestant church entirely overboard. I beg leave to ask him, does he consider the existence of a church at all absolutely necessary, under the Christian dispensation? He holds, it appears, the opinion of justification by faith *only*. What does St. Paul say?

"If I should have all faith, so that I could move mountains, and have not charity I am nothing."—1 Cor. xiii, 2.

There is an example of faith without charity. St. James says,

"What shall it profit, my brethren, if a man say he hath faith, but hath not works? Shall faith be able to save him? ii, 14. "For as the body without the spirit is dead; so also faith without works is dead."—Ibid. 26.

If every thing be contained in the scriptures, why has not Mr. Pope shown me texts to prove the procession of the Holy Ghost —baptism, with the sign of the cross, &c. Why was it decreed by the Apostles, at the council held in Jerusalem, that it appeared good to them to abstain from all blood? I believe Mr. Pope has no objection to take some good gravy occasionally. In doing so, he goes in opposition to a positive command of the Apostles. I have produced a commandment of our Saviour for washing the feet, which taken *juxta tenorem verborum*, is as positive a commandment as any to be found in scripture. Mr. Pope has endeavoured to show, that this was applicable to hot countries, as if the commandments of the Lord were to be adopted according to the different temperatures of different countries, and not applied to all indiscriminately. Is it not obvious to common sense, that Christ intended his commandments should be observed in cold as well as in hot countries? I called on my opponent to produce proofs from scripture, authorizing the baptism of infants. But I should recollect that he throws baptism overboard. He adheres to justification by faith only. I would agree fully in the dogma with him if the word "only" were removed. For what, I would ask, did God give free-will to man? And why did our blessed Redeemer enjoin the keeping of the commandments as a condition for salvation?

"But if thou vil enter into life, KEEP THE COMMANDMENTS."- -Matt. chap. xiv, 17.

I now come to Mr. Pope's rule of faith. He will say, as he has said, that it is contained in the *holy scriptures alone.* I beg to ask my opponent, if the scriptures alone be his rule of faith, is it not necessary for us to examine all the inspired books which have been written? Does he believe it necessary to know the whole Bible, or a portion of it, for salvation? If it be only necessary to know a portion of the Bible, I call upon him to produce his authority from scripture for that belief.

Mr. POPE.—It may be well to read and know the whole scriptures, if a person have the opportunity; but I believe that a man can be saved without reading the whole Bible.

Mr. MAGUIRE.—Show me a text to justify that belief?

Mr. POPE.—When the Apostle was asked, what shall I do to be saved? he answered—"Believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved." Acts, xvi, 31. At one period, only the Old Testament was written.

Mr. MAGUIRE.—When it only was written, no person was called upon to found his sole rule of faith upon it.

Mr. POPE.—I conceive if a person have the opportunity, it is right to know all the scriptures. But a person can be saved without knowing the whole volume.

Mr. MAGUIRE.—So, if a person read the Old Testament merely, and is not acquainted with the New Testament, he may be saved?

Mr. POPE.—I will make no such concession.

Mr. MAGUIRE.—I would much rather you would give us texts of scripture, and not mere assertion. I never heard of so loose a doctrine. I shall now reduce Mr. Pope to a dilemma.—If the scriptures *alone* be his rule of faith, I ask is it not necessary, in that case, to examine *all* the canonical books that have been written? Now, *all* the canonical books that have been written, are not to be found in any part of the known world. God would have preserved all the inspired writings, had he intended that the scriptures *alone* should be the rule of our faith; but God has not preserved all the inspired books of scripture, for not less than twenty have perished; therefore God did not intend them as the *only* rule of faith—Mr. Pope must admit, according to his principles, that it is necessary to examine *all* the canonical books—for if not, how could he ascertain his rule of faith? there

might happen to be in these books, which are lost, or which he should pass over, texts opposed to his doctrine, and which perhaps expressly taught that the rule of faith was not in the scriptures alone. If, on the other hand, Mr. Pope shall contend that it is only necessary to know a *portion* of the Bible, I call upon him to prove that to me by a positive text of scripture.

Now, again, either *all* the inspired books that have been written are necessary to form the rule of our faith, or only a *part* is necessary. If Mr. Pope shall assert that *all* are necessary, then the scriptures are no rule of faith, since *all* the scriptures are not to be found. But if Mr. Pope say, that only a *part* is necessary, let him produce a text of scripture to prove that as we cannot *take his bare word on matters of such importance;* but I defy Mr. Pope to *produce any such text*, therefore the scripture cannot be the sole rule of faith. A living authority must be left to direct and decide on matters of controversy.

I shall now show you that we have not all the scriptures. In the book of Numbers, chap. xxi, 14, we read thus :

"It is said in the book of the wars of the Lord."

Where is that book? Gone.

In the third book of Kings, (which Protestants call the first) Chron. iv, 32, we read that

"Solomon spoke three thousand proverbs," and "his canticles were a thousand and five."

Where are these? What a small portion of them we have now

In the second book of Chronicles, ix, 29, it is said—

"Now the rest of the acts of Solomon, first and last, are they not written in the book of Nathan the prophet, and in the prophecy of Ahijah, and in the vision of Iddo."

Where are all those books?

The first book of Chronicles concludes with these words,

"Name the acts of David the king, first and last, behold be they not written in the book of Samuel the seer, and in the book of Nathan the prophet, and in the book of Gad the seer?"

All those prophecies are lost.

In St. Paul's epistle to the Colossians he commands them to read in the church the epistle to the Laodiceans—Where is that epistle? Lost.

In St. Paul's *first* epistle to the Corinthians, v, 9, he says,

"I wrote to you an epistle."

Where is the epistle which St. Paul wrote to them before the epistle which is now called *first?* It is not in existence. So here we find two epistles of St. Paul lost.

St. Matthew (and here I may remark that the *original Hebrew* gospel of St. Matthew is quite lost. I should like to know under

such circumstances, how a Protestant can FOUND HIS FAITH *upon the gospel of St. Matthew, which is lost, unless he depend upon the authority of an infallible translator*)—St. Matthew, I say, xxvii, 9, cites words as spoken by the prophet Jeremy, which are not to be found in any part of Jeremy now extant. Wherefore, part of Jeremy the prophet is lost, as Cotrzein in this place proves out of 2 Chron. xxxv, 20. St. Matthew also, ii, 23, says,

"It was spoken by the prophets he shall be called a Nazarene."

The books of the prophets who spoke thus have also perished for we find Christ never called a Nazarene in all the prophets' books at present extant St. Chrysostom on this place, (Homil. ix, in Matt. i,) says,

"Many of the prophetical monuments have perished; for the Jews being careless, and not only careless, but also impious, they have carelessly lost some of these monuments; others, they have partly burnt, partly torn in pieces."

Here we find twenty books of scripture lost. Will Mr. Pope show that none of those lost books are necessary, when he acknowleges no church, and asserts that the Bible is his *sole* rule of faith? Mr. Pope talks much about his rule of faith, and yet he cannot tell where it is to be found. If he say that the scriptures are not to be had—that a portion of scripture is only necessary for salvation, let him produce to me a positive text of scripture to that effect—for I allow nothing but a *positive text of scripture* to decide upon such a vitally important point. I challenge him to show where his sole rule of faith is to be found But he cannot produce any text to prove that *all* the scriptures are not necessary, or that a *portion* of them is sufficient, for salvation. Mr. Pope has had recourse to the Fathers to prove the authenticity of scripture, though he rejected their authority when quoted by me in support of the doctrine of purgatory.

I have shown from seventeen holy Fathers down to the sixth century, that the doctrine of purgatory was retained and professed throughout the Catholic church. He has quoted St. Jerome in proof of the authority and authenticity of the sacred scriptures.—But when I quote Jerome and the other Fathers in support of the doctrine of purgatory, they are very consistently rejected by Mr. Pope. He talked of Hebrew. I venture to say he is unacquainted with the Hebrew points. He spoke of the original Hebrew copies. Would it not be necessary for the ignorant Protestant, according to the principles of Mr. Pope to compare all the Hebrew, Greek, and Latin copies of the scriptures, before he could be satisfied of their inspiration? All the proofs which Mr. Pope has advanced, of the inspiration of the sacred scriptures, rest upon human authority, and no act of faith can be built upon such a foundation. Mr. Pope certainly spoke of an

internal evidence. Now, if that be admitted, it must be admitted as a first principle. It is denied, and ridiculed by the learned Chillingworth, a Protestant divine, who, in reply to the words of his adversary, "That the divinity of a writing cannot be known by itself alone, but by some extrinsic authority," says, *This you need not prove, for no wise man denies it.*"

If it were a first principle and self-evident, as Mr. Pope would have it, who would deny it? The truth of first principles no rational man ever doubted. But millions of Christians deny the doctrine of internal evidence. The Arians, the Manichæans, the Marcionists, &c, all denied internal evidence. The Catholics throughout the whole world for eighteen hundred years, could not discover this *inward light*, but, on the contrary, have loudly protested against the doctrine of internal illumination, since that new system has been broached. It cannot, therefore, be a first principle, which Chillingworth himself and millions of Christians unequivocally denied. *It is only a foolish and visionary scheme, to which those who have no better resort, to prove the inspiration of the sacred scriptures.*

Mr. Pope.—Gentlemen—I need scarcely observe, that my friend on the opposite side of the table has been speaking on the subject which belonged to the second day of the meeting. Mr. Maguire has protested against the line of our present proceeding. He has spoken much of obedience to authority; and, surely, when the chairmen decided, he was bound, according to his own principles, to bow to their decision. I submit to every man of common sense, whether the line of argument, adopted by me on this occasion, was not perfectly justifiable—namely, to show that the peculiar doctrines, held by the church of Rome, were anti-scriptural, and that the Reformers were, in consequence, called upon to separate from her communion. How could this charge have been substantiated without the consideration of the doctrines themselves? My friend should remember, that not satisfied with the abstract question of private judgment for the second day, he selected two or three other topics of debate—the right of private judgment, to pronounce upon *the canonicity, integrity, authenticity, and interpretation of the holy scriptures.* The second day was the time set apart for the consideration of those subjects. My friend seemed to state, that he held in his hand the Sixtine edition of the Vulgate, but I say, that the edition which he produced, is the Clementine.

[Here Mr. Maguire called upon Mr. O'Reilly, into whose hands he said that he had given the Sixtine copy for the purpose of bringing it to the meeting.]

Mr. Pope.—I beg to remark, that so great is the scarcity of the Sixtine Bible, that the Jesuit Fisher not merely denied that any were in existence, but stated, that Sixtus V, had not published any edition of the Vulgate whatever! Masses, we are told, are generally offered for rich and poor: but, if they be offered in this general way, why, I would ask, why should the Priests take money specially from the rich? My friend brought forward a passage, "Faith without charity is dead." The Apostles, I admit, speak of such a faith; but it was merely such as enabled an individual to work miracles, and yet left him uninfluenced by the grace of God. The genuine faith of God's people "purifies the heart," (Acts xv, 9,) works by love, (Gal. v, 6,) and overcomes the world (1 John v, 4,) enabling the Christian to act in consistency with his profession, and is therefore the grand germ of spiritual life, and the parent of Christian morality. Although the difference may appear trivial between being justified by faith, and by faith *alone*, in truth the distinction is most important. If the scriptures, I am asked, be the only rule of faith, are we not then obliged to be acquainted with *all* the scriptures, lest one part should contradict another. I meet the question, and say, God never contradicts himself; he never varies, but is the same yesterday, to-day and for ever: that which God speaks once, as to moral truth, is eternal and immutable. My friend has observed, that if all the scriptures need not be examined, then all are not necessary, I answer, that it is the duty of all men, if they have opportunity, to read all the scriptures. Yet, provided they place their hopes on Christ, (and in order to do so, they need the influence of the Holy Spirit) they will be accepted through him at the bar of God, though they may not have read every part of the sacred volume. My friend has spoken about sundry books that have been lost, which, he says, formed part of the inspired records, and has directed our attention to passages of the Bible, which allude to other writings. But the onus rests on him, before his argument can carry any weight, to prove that the books of which he speaks, ever belonged to the sacred canon—that they were the dictates of inspiration, and not portions of *mere ordinary history*, which recorded some particulars that might not have been mentioned in the canonical writings. I would also beg to observe, that my friend believes in tradition and infallibility. Roman Catholic Divines, assuming that the Jewish church was infallible, are in the habit of arguing from analogy, that the church of Rome is gifted with unerring authority. Taking Mr. Maguire on this ground, I would ask, what was the use of infallibility to the Jewish church, if it could not succeed in preserving the canon of the Old Testament, perfect and entire Further—the onus

rests on him to show, that either the written tradition, or the *viva voce* exposition of the church of Rome, has supplied the portion which, Mr. Maguire says, has been lost, or perfectly accords with it. Now I take the sacred scriptures which we possess, and with them I contrast the traditions of the Roman Catholic church, and finding that they are in opposition to the oracles of truth, I conclude that they are not of God; for God cannot contradict himself. My friend did not like that I should refer to the Fathers on the canonicity and authenticity of the scriptures. I admit their authority as credible testimony—but not as infallible. We must be convinced, that when the scriptures are quoted by very ancient writers, they must at least have been coeval with the authors who cite passages from them. I appeal to the Fathers, to prove by their historical evidence the authenticity of the scriptures. This kind of evidence in support of the scriptures, is much more powerful than that in favour of any other ancient record. It matters not very much for my argument, as to the antiquity of the sacred volume, whether the character of the Fathers who quote from it, be good or evil. Mr. Maguire has allowed the authority of the Fathers, as faithful witnesses.

My friend on the opposite side has scouted the idea of internal evidence. If God has said, that his invisible attributes are to be discerned by his works.

"For the invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, his eternal power also and divinity."—Rom. i, 20.

And if it be true that "God has magnified his word above all his name," (Ps. cxxxviii, 2,) may we not expect that the Deity has stamped, in an especial manner, upon this page of Revelation, the impress of his own divine character? Mr. Maguire has observed, that, according to my showing, God has not provided for the spiritual wants of all mankind. I return the argument—is not the poor man, according to his principles, in a worse condition than he would be, according to mine? Is the poor man to have recourse to councils and Fathers? Again I stand on firmer ground. Mr. Maguire, in order to prove the truth of the Bible, must, according to his principles, first prove the authority of the church, and refer the poor man to innumerable folios. I have only to preach the Gospel, and to put the sacred scriptures into the hands of those whom I address, at the same time adding, if necessary, some arguments in support of their internal evidence. One reason which may convince every unprejudiced mind that God intended his word to rest for support principally upon internal evidence, is the fact, that few would be able to examine the general proofs in support of the inspired

volume. God has chosen many of the poor of this world to be bright gems in the Saviour's diadem; and when we know that the great bulk of mankind are doomed to labour, the fact furnishes us with a presumptive argument in favour of the proofs, which rest on internal evidence, as being open to every individual who seriously examines the sacred oracles. My friend has said, that I was afraid of the Fathers in reference to purgatory—permit me to say, that was I not afraid to meet him on the grounds of the Fathers; I had various other quotations from their writings; And here allow me to observe, that my opponent quoted a passage from Cyprian's letter to Antonian—"It is one thing to be waiting for pardon, another to attain glory," &c, &c. It has nothing to do with purgatory. The church had relaxed some penitential censures against those who had fallen in persecution; and St. Cyprian was defending this measure, and proving that the state of the martyrs entering at once into glory was so much superior to the miseries of the lapsed, who were anxiously expecting re-admission into the church, and must feel anxiety about a future state, that there was no danger to be anticipated from the relaxation—this he shows by adding "it is one thing to expect with anxiety the judgment of the Lord in the day of judgment—another to be crowned by the Lord." Rigaltius, a Roman Catholic commentator, gives this explanation.

Further, in reference to the Fathers. Most of the quotations adduced by Mr. Maguire do not, I imagine, support the doctrine of purgatory: they refer to oblations for the dead; but those oblations for the dead were not offered for souls in purgatory. In the primitive church a practice existed of making *thanksgivings* and offerings for those who had departed in the faith As Mr. Maguire has quoted a passage from Sir Edwin Sandys, he can have no objection to my reading an extract or two from the same author. Sir Edwin gives us the following general view of the church of Rome, p. 35:—

"This being the main ground work of their policy; and the general means to build and establish it in the minds of all men; the particular ways they hold to ravish all affections, and to fit each humor (which, their jurisdiction and power being but persuasive and voluntary, they principally regard), are well nigh infinite; there being not any thing either sacred or profane, no virtue nor vice almost, no things of how contrary condition soever; which they make not in some sort to serve that turn; that each fancy may be satisfied, and each appetite find what to feed on. Whatsoever either wealth can sway with the lovers, or voluntary poverty with the despisers, of the world; what honour with the ambitious; what obedience with the humble; what great employment with stirring and mettled spirits; what perpetual quiet with heavy and restive bodies; what content the pleasant nature can take in pastimes and jollity; what contrariwise the austere mind in discipline and rigour; what love either chastity can raise in the pure, or voluptuousness in the dissolute; what allurements are in knowledge to draw the contemplative, or in actions of state to possess the practic dispositions, what with the

hopeful prerogative of reward can work; what errors, doubts, and dangers with the fearful; what change of vows with the rash, of estate with the inconstant; what pardons with the faulty, or supplies with the defective; what miracles with the credulous; what visions with the fantastical; what gorgeousness of shows with the vulgar and simple; what multitude of ceremonies with the superstitous and ignorant; what prayer with the devout, what with the charitable works of piety; what rules of higher perfection with elevated affections; what dispensing of breach of all rules with men of lawless conditions: in sum, what thing soever can prevail with any man either for himself to pursue, or at least-wise to love, reverence, or honour in another (for even therein also man's nature receiveth great satisfaction), the same is found with them, not as in other places of the world, by casuality blended without order, and of necessity, but sorted in great part into several professions, countenanced with reputation, honoured with prerogatives, facilitated with provisions, and yearly maintenance, and either (as the better things) advanced with expectation of reward, or borne with, how bad soever, with sweet and silent permission. What pomp, what riot, to that of their cardinals? what severity of life comparable to their hermits and capuchins? who wealthier than their prelates? who poorer by vow and profession than their mendicants? On the one side of the street a cloister of virgins, on the other a sty of courtezans with public toleration; this day all in masks, with all looseness and foolery: to-morrow all in processions, whipping themselves till the blood follow; on one door an excommunication, throwing to hell all transgressors: on another a jubilee, or full discharge from all transgressions. Who learneder in all kind of sciences than their Jesuits? What thing more ignorant than their ordinary mass-priests? What prince so able to prefer his servants and followers as the Pope, and in so great multitude? Who able to take deeper or readier revenge on his enemies? What pride equal unto his, making kings kiss his pantofle? what humility greater than his, shriving himself daily on his knees to an ordinary priest? Who difficulter in despatch of causes to the greatest? who easier in giving audience to the meanest? Where greater rigour in the world in acting the observation of the church laws? where less care or conscience of the commandments of God? To taste flesh on a Friday, where suspicion might fasten, were a matter for the inquisition; whereas, on the other side, the Sunday is one of their greatest market-days. To conclude: never state, never government in the world so strangely compacted of infinite contrarieties, all tending to entertain the several humours of all men, and to work what kind of effects soever they shall desire; where rigour and remissness, cruelty and lenity, are so combined, that, with neglect of the church, to stir aught is a sin unpardonable; whereas with duty towards the church, and by intercession for her allowance, with respective attendance of her pleasure, no law almost of God or nature so sacred, which, one way or other, they find not means to dispense with, or at least-wise permit the breach of, by connivance and without disturbance."—Page 34, et seq.

"Europæ Speculum, or, a View or Survey of the state of Religion in the western parts of the world: wherein the Roman Religion, and pregnant policies of the church of Rome to support the same, are notably displayed; with some other memorable discoveries and commemorations."—Lond. 1632.

Sir Edwin Sandys gives the following description of the state of religion in Italy in his time:—

"The whole country is strangely overflown and overborne with wickedness, with filthiness of speech, with beastliness of actions; both governors and subjects—both priests and friars, each striving as it were with other in an impudentness therein; even so far forth, that what elsewhere would not be tolerated, is there in high honour—what in some other places even a loose person would be ashamed to confess, their priests and friars refrain not openly to practise."—P. 19

Again, p. 160. "It doth grieve me to speak, yea, the thought of it must needs bring horror and detestation; what a multitude of Atheists do brave it in all places—there most, where the papacy is most in its prime—what renouncers of God, blasphemers of his Son, villanizers of his saints, and scorners of his service: who think it a glorious grace to adore the king of a country; but to name or think reverently of the Creator of the world, to proceed from a timerous base-mindedness and abjectness."

Sir Edwin Sandys also describes the state of religion in Spain in his time. Though Mr. Maguire objected to the authority of Mr. White, he cannot refuse to admit that of Sir Edwin Sandys.

"The next is Spain, reputed *wholly* the Pope's also, as having been a long time governed by the most devoted king, and *longer* curbed in by the most cruel inquisition that ever the world had for the upholding of that sway." * *

"For a kingdom that hath the sirname of Catholic [illegible] greater danger in the world, either wholly or in great part to cast off Christianity, unless grace from above and better wisdom to stay the increase of those *pestilent cankers* of Mahomedanism and Judaism, which threaten the final decay, and eating out of Christianism."—Pp. 163, 164.

"There is in Spain a sort of people of the Marrany, as they term them, who are baptized Jews and Moors, and many of them in secret withal circumcised Christians.

"All which, although conforming themselves in some sort of outward show unto the Christian religion, yet are thought in heart to be utterly averse from it, and to retain an inward desire to return to that superstition, from which their ancestors by rigour and terror were driven; and the Jews will say in Italy that there come divers Spaniards to them to be circumcised there, and so away to Constantinople to plant in the east."—Pp. 164, 165.

I shall not occupy your time with other quotations. You will doubtless ask, how could such passages occur in a work which apparently advocated the church of Rome. *Sir Edwin Sandys gave the statement which Mr. Maguire read from his works merely as the allegations of Roman Catholic ecclesiastics in support of their system.** You shall see whether this charge is not founded upon fact. In page 24, Sir Edwin Sandys begins a sketch of the arguments which Roman Catholics employ in advocating the church of Rome; and after having given the sketch, he adds in page 33:

"This is the main course of their persuading at this day, whereby they seek to establish that former foundation: in the unfolding whereof I have been the longer, because trial hath taught me, that not by some men's private election, but, as it should seem, by common order, direction, or consent, they have relinquished all other courses, and hold them to this, as the most effectual means, in the way of persuasion, to insinuate their desire, and to work their design."

Here is "iniquitas quotationis."—Hear it gentlemen! After this *exposé*, I ask, is Mr. Maguire justified in boasting, as he has done, of his quotations having been taken from the originals?

* A debate on the above quotation having arisen, viz. whether Mr. Maguire quoted it, as put hypothetically, as it is in the work from which he took it, namely, Fletcher's Comparative View, or not; some gentlemen affirming that he did, and some that he did not—it was agreed that the text should stand, and that this note should be added.

I have brought him to one original, and you have now seen how ill his quotation bears the test of such an examination!

I come more immediately to the question, and I call distinctly upon Mr. Maguire to do so. He is, perhaps, reserving some seemingly plausible arguments for the last half hour, when he knows that no opportunity will be afforded me of replying. I call on him to relinquish this *ruse de guerre*. He may be satisfied with the manœuvre, in which he succeeded the first day, when, by speaking at one time but a quarter of an hour, he deprived me of the advantage of closing the business of the day; while he had an opportunity of addressing the meeting in speeches exceeding by one those which I delivered. I now call on him to come like a man to the question: let him not raise a dust, and then hide the subject behind the cloud which he has created.

I have shown that the reformers were justified in their separation from the church of Rome, by the debased moral condition of that church as well as by the unscriptural nature of her doctrines. Mr. Maguire has asserted, that my quotations, as to the immoral character of the church of Rome, were from Protestant writers. I beg leave to state, that the authors whose testimonies I brought forward, were *Roman Catholics*. Let Mr. Maguire show that his church was not in error: let him show that her doctrines were scriptural: and then I shall admit that the reformers were not justified in separating from her communion. Mr. Maguire will talk much of the evils of concession, of private judgment, and fanaticism, which, he will maintain, were exhibited at the time of the Reformation. We shall hear, doubtless, of the character of Henry VIII, of Luther, and of others; but I now say to Mr. Maguire, *come to the point, and do not evade the question.* You stand before an enlightened assembly: the PEOPLE of Ireland are becoming daily wiser; they will see, believe me, on whose side sophistry exists, and will distinguish empty unfounded assertions from solid proofs; nor will they suffer boasts to pass for argument. Let Mr. Maguire then meet me on the point at issue. I stand ready to vindicate the Reformation.

Mr. MAGUIRE.—I never before saw the superiority of close argument so triumphantly displayed—has Mr. Pope ever glanced at the questions which I put to him so repeatedly and so pointedly? I inquired from him the scriptural foundation upon which a Protestant can build an act of faith: *I expected—you expected*, no doubt, a distinct answer to the question—*has he dared to give it?* Protestants and Catholics, I beseech you to look to that. Let the *fact be recorded and go forth to the world.* He has quoted from Fra Paolo, who was no Catholic, and whom Bishop Burnett calls a Calvinistic heretic. The Jansenists have

been condemned by the Catholic church, and it is not fair to quote them against me. The only Catholics to whom he referred, were Baronius and Bishop Fisher.

Protestants and Catholics, I again beseech you to remark, that my opponent has not attempted to answer the arguments which I addressed to him relative to the scriptures: he has indeed made an eloquent harangue upon the necessity of the Reformation—I shall satisfy you on that subject before I have done. It is foolish to endeavour to escape from my *direct arguments* by such an artifice. I may remark to Mr. Pope, that in quoting historians, he should resort to those of approved character, and well established veracity. I repeat my challenge to Mr. Pope to answer the arguments which I brought forward relative to the scriptures. I spoke of the scriptures which have been lost: Mr. Pope attempted to throw discredit on them,—he said they were mere histories, and not inspired. I ask, would they have been referred to as holy books, in the *genuine* and *inspired* writings and *recommended there*, if they were not *equally inspired?* If they be *mere* histories, as Mr. Pope would have you believe, then the inspired writers must have been *guilty of fraud in referring to them.* Mr. Pope includes in his sweeping denunciation, the two epistles of St. Paul, which I proved to have been lost. Will Mr. Pope say, that they too were *mere histories?*—Will he dare to dispute their inspiration?—Mr. Pope, one would think, wishes to convert religion and scripture into mere history. I shall indulge in no rhetorical manœuvres; nor will I amaze you with high sounding language, instead of defensive arguments—I shall adhere to close disputation. I appeal to the judgments of the candid and the impartial. Have I not shown the fallacy of the few arguments advanced by my Reverend opponent? Mr. Pope has put a curious interpretation on the remarkable words of St. Paul; "If I have all faith, so that I could remove mountains, and have not charity, I am nothing." Mr. Pope, says that this is merely a faith that can work miracles. Surely, if the faith which could move mountains, and work miracles, could not save a man unless he had charity; *a fortiori*, the faith which could *not* perform miracles, would not save a man without charity. He says, that God could not contradict himself; and he gave us an eloquent description of the wonderful attributes of the Deity—I never gave utterance to the absurd and blasphemous opinion, that God could contradict himself. Mr. Pope, I repeat, is only raising castles in the air for the mere purpose of throwing them down again. He has returned to his doctrine of internal evidence—he says, that God Almighty knew that the great mass of mankind would not be able to answer the sophistries of the Deists

and Infidels; that owing to their ignorance, their habits, and their want of opportunities, they would be unable of themselves to remove the objections, which the ingenuity of the unbeliever would throw in their way. This is the most powerful argument that could be urged, to prove that God did not intend this holy book to form the *sole* rule of man's faith: God always, in his infinite wisdom, adapts the means to the end—If Mr. Pope's doctrine were true, would the Almighty have adapted the means to the end? Mr. Pope's doctrine directly militates against the attributes of the Deity.—I again call upon him to tell me what *particular portion* of scripture is *sufficient for salvation*, and to found his opinion, not upon reasonings, but upon a positive and direct text of scripture.

Gentlemen, in proceeding to discuss the Reformation, I shall, at the outset, lay down two principles upon which I found my arguments. My *first* principle is this—that God never, in any instance, employed notorious characters, savage and ferocious men, immoral, and self-degraded wretches, to reform religion. My *second* proposition is, that the reformers of the sixteenth century were men of that description. If I prove both these propositions, and neither, I imagine, can be reasonably disputed, I shall bring this argument to a speedy conclusion. Be pleased to observe, that in all history we read of no reformers of religion but Moses and the prophets, Jesus Christ, and the Apostles, who were the agents and instruments under Christ. Moses may, in the strict sense of the word, be called the reformer of the Patriachal religion. Religion had been preserved to his days by the tradition of the patriarchs. If we revert to the patriarchs, we will find God preserving religion, not through the instrumentality of bad and proverbially corrupt men, but of such characters as Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, &c. For the space of two thousand years, religion was preserved by the patriarchs, before a line of scripture was written. Religion was then wafted down by *their tradition*, pure, simple, and uncorrupted. But the time arrived when the old religion was to be built upon a more permanent basis, to be reformed, and enlarged. Moses was selected by God for that purpose, to combine the traditions of the patriarchs into one settled law. Moses proved his extraordinary mission by the performance of manifest and splendid miracles. The prophets too proved their divine mission by unquestioned miracles. When our Saviour came to perfect the Jewish religion, do we not read of the splendid miracles performed by him in attestation of his character as a reformer? Did not the Redeemer declare, that if he had not performed such miracles, the Jews who disbelieved, would have had *no sin in them*? Did he not emphatically say, that if he had not performed such mira

cles, they would have been justified in putting him to death? I never said, that God granted infallibility to the Jewish synagogue, but I affirm, that it never, *de facto* erred till the prophecies were accomplished, and the Redeemer came, who then established his church, to which he promised *infallibility in express terms.* If, then, the Jewish church, to which infallibility was not promised, did not err till the coming of Christ, *a fortiori*, the church which Christ established, and to which he expressly promised infallibility will never err. Hear the words of Christ himself:

"The church is the pillar and ground of truth."—"The gates of hell shall never prevail against it."—"He that will not hear the church, let him be unto thee as the heathen and the publican."—"I will send you the spirit of truth to teach you all truth."—"I will send you another Paraclete, to ABIDE WITH YOU FOR EVER."—"Ye are the light of the world."—"Ye are the salt of the earth."—"A city built upon a mountain cannot be concealed."

It is Mr. Pope who would make the God of Heaven contradict himself. As the poor and ignorant man could never of himself ascertain the inspiration of the scriptures, nor discover therein Mr. Pope's rule of faith—God appointed the living authority of the church to guide and direct him, and which church I have already proved to be infallible.

Mr. Pope has recurred to the mass, and quoted the apostate Blanco White—a notable authority truly, to oppose the authority and credit of the Catholic church. He might as well quote the authority of Julian the apostate, against the Catholic church. We are desired by St. Paul to avoid a heretic, as one condemned by his private judgment—*proprio judicio condemnatus*—and St. John forbids to *even salute him.* Mr. Pope says, that I make *him* a heretic—I deny that, in the sense in which I used the word heretic, Mr. Pope is one. He was born of Protestant parents—I say with St. Augustin, that he is a heretic who goes out of the church of himself and chooses a religion of his own.

Dr. Johnson, who was a Protestant, and whose orthodoxy cannot be questioned—whose piety and devotion were well known offered up prayers for his mother.

In the course of his observations, Mr. Pope has alluded to the longer time which was granted me to speak on the first day. It arose from the circumstance of my having sat down on my previous half hours too soon, and consequently, I was allowed a few minutes at the close of the discussion to make up for that deficiency. I had proposed then that the discussion should be carried on by interrogatory, and it strikes me that that would be the better way of conducting it. By the interrogative mode, you perceive, that I have already succeeded in making my opponent give contradictory answers to two questions relative to the circulation of the sacred scriptures while he supposed he

and confined me in an imaginary circle, I put a question to him which he has not attempted to answer. He could not tell what portion of scripture was *necessary*, to *instruct unto salvation*, or what *portion unnecessary*.

It is rather strange, that Mr. Pope, who professes such veneration for the Son of God, should make nothing of the promises of our Saviour to his church, and endeavour to explain them away by sophistry and absurd metaphysical distinctions. Let that fact be marked—who then is the advocate of the Bible? I, who hold that the sacred word of the Redeemer, bears the stamp of eternal truth, or he who attempts to explain away that eternal word by allegories and metaphors? This is the man, forsooth, who pretends to believe nothing but what is contained in the scriptures! I insist that God has revealed truths which are not in the sacred scriptures. I maintain that the word of God is infallible, and I maintain that the promises made by Christ to his church that she shall never err—promises so plain, so explicit, and so obvious—promises which are dwelt upon and repeated by the holy Fathers, are eternally true and can never fail. "*Heaven* and *earth* will *pass away*, *but my words will never pass away*." I have already read to this meeting, various passages from the Fathers in support of the doctrines of infallibility, purgatory, and the invocation of saints.

With regard to the reformers, I have laid down a *clear* principle—that God will never employ openly abandoned, proverbially vicious, self convicted, immortal men, as the reformers of a pre-existing church, or of any religion. I have already proved from the sacred volume, that the extraordinary ministers of his sacred word shall have the broad seal of his mission, to wit, miracles, affixed upon them. If it be proved that the *ordinary* ministers of religion may be vicious and corrupt, it does not follow that the *extraordinary* ministers of religion, who came forward as reformers, should bear that character. Christ did not preach his mission without exhibiting to the world the great seal of divinity.

The mission to which Luther, and Calvin, and Cranmer pretended, was not an ordinary one. If their mission were an ordinary one, they should have remained in that church which existed before them. They should have shown an extraordinary mission before they departed from that church, which consisted of all the Christian churches in communion with the see of Rome where her visible head resided, showing forth the commission granted by Christ to his church. Luther's commission (if any) as a reformer of the Catholic church, must have been an extraordinary one. Did he prove it by miracles? It is said indeed that Calvin, in order to prove his mission by a miracle, to remove

the objections against him on that head, induced a man for a large sum of money to feign death, in order that he (Calvin) might get the credit of raising him from the dead. The man, however, literally rose no more, and Calvin took good care never to repeat the experiment.

I shall now proceed to give you the character of the Catholic church, from writers, whose authority I suppose my learned adversary will not be inclined to dispute. Every line which I shall quote shall be from Protestant historians. Observe, I am not about to quote from masked Papists against the Protestant church, as my opponent has quoted from masked Protestants against the Catholic church.

Dr. Spry says,

"From the facts which are recorded in scripture, and which other historical testimony confirms, we infer that the Apostles, in the exercise of the power vested in them, instituted that ecclesiastical polity *which was maintained in the church until the period of the Reformation.*"

Davis says,

"It is acknowledged on all hands, that the church of Rome, in its original state, was Apostolical and pure. And even at the present day, it has persevered in all the fundamental articles of the *true and Christian faith.* And the sacraments ordained by the Gospel are here administered by a priesthood which derives its appointment, by an uninterrupted succession, from the Apostles, and its *authority from our Great Master.*"

No wonder, indeed, that these learned Protestant Divines should so frankly and openly avow, that our doctrine and our priesthood are derived from the Apostles, and our authority to preach and teach, from our Great Master himself. For as they received whatever is valid of their ordination from us, such confession is absolutely necessary to prop up their own quaking system, and to give even a specious colour to their claims.

Dr. Daubeny thus writes:

"The commission originally delivered by Christ to his Apostles, has been handed down in regular succession. Under the *authority of this commission*, the religion of Christ was introduced into this country, at a very early period: and the appointment of ministers under the sanction of the Divine Authority, has been uniformly received and *preserved* in the church, wherever it has existed, for 1500 years."

In the British Critic, we read,

"The church government maintained by the church of Rome, has been *traced without a single break in the chain, up to the immediate successors of the Apostles: and the chain of the episcopacy was unbroken for* 1500 *years.*"

Dr. Tomline, in his Elements, says:

"When the Reformation took place in England, the Bishops and clergy were not consecrated and ordained *again.* They had received consecration and ordination from men to whom the power of consecrating and ordaining had been transmitted from the Apostles: and that power was not vitiated."

Daubeny thus defines Schism :

"Wherever there is a wilful separation from the communion of the church of Christ, there, according to the original idea upon this subject, a division of Christ's mystical body takes place ; and there the sin of schism is to be found. Schism then consists in a disunion of the members of the church, occasioned by the want of obedience to the government which Christ by his Apostles settled in it ; and a consequent separation from its communion, in contradiction to the divine plan of its establishment."

Mr. POPE—Gentlemen, I beg to observe that my quotations have been from Roman Catholic authors. Though I have referred to Father Paul during the discussion, yet on this day I have not quoted from his writings. I again ask, whether greater difficulties do not lie on the side of Mr. Maguire than on mine, in providing for the spiritual wants of the poor. We are not to dictate to the Almighty : we are not to reason from the line of procedure which in *our conceptions* the Deity ought to adopt : we are not to bring his dispensations to the bar of our erring judgments : we are to draw our conclusions from what God *has done*—not from what we may *imagine*, *He ought to have done*. I have not this day quoted the authority of Mr. White, although I believe him to be a most respectable and conscientious man. My friend says that I am not a heretic. I may thank him as an individual for the admission ; but I beg to know by what authority he makes the assertion ? According to the doctrines of the church of Rome, I need scarcely remark, that all who are without her pale are heretics, infidels, or excommunicated persons. It is well known, that exclusive salvation is her doctrine, except in cases of invincible ignorance ; and invincible ignorance, I thank God, can rarely be the lot of any Protestant in these countries. With respect to Sir Edwin Sandys, I am perfectly satisfied that a Roman Catholic and a Protestant clergyman should examine the original work, and decide the question at issue between us. [Mr. Maguire agreed to this proposal.] My friend has told us that God never employed bad men to accomplish the Reformation of his church. Our question is not, whether the instruments were good or evil, but whether the separation from the church of Rome, which took place in the sixteenth century, was justifiable. Mr. Maguire has referred to one or two authorities, to show that there existed some immoral men among the reformers, and particularly instanced Luther. In noticing these charges, permit me to remind you that I am descending from the real point at issue. I again assert, that the question before us has not been met on the part of Mr. Maguire. I would impress this fact upon the minds of the population at large. My friend has quoted from Protestant authorities in favour of the church of Rome : but I would ask, did those quotations meet the charges

brought against her at the time of the Reformation. One of those quotations, referring to her doctrines, says, that she retains all fundamental truths. Were I to grant this assertion yet our charge is that she has added novelties to those fundamental truths, and by that addition nullified them. With respect to the character of Luther, I beg to read you a quotation from Maimbourg, a Roman Catholic historian, quoted in Fry's Church History, p. 284.

"HE LIVED A MORAL LIFE, AND WAS NOT GIVEN, IN THE SMALLEST DEGREE, TO COVETOUSNESS OR ANY OTHER VICE."

My friend asserts that Moses, and the prophets, and our Lord Jesus Christ, were moral men, and proved the divinity of their mission by miracles. Need I say, that I admit the truth of the observation? I shall meet it: you, gentlemen, shall judge whether I do so successfully. Moses came to give perfection to the preceding dispensation: so did the Lord Jesus Christ. The reformers did not usher in a new dispensation, neither did they add any thing to that which was at the time in existence: they only returned to first principles: they dash to the ground the unscriptural superstructure which had been raised by the church of Rome, and brought to light the fundamental truths of the Christian system, in their native symmetry, beauty, and strength. As they did not introduce a new dispensation, it was not, therefore, necessary that they should perform miracles. I find, that under the Jewish dispensation, the Israelites were cautioned against those, who even predicted events which actually came to pass, but who endeavoured to lead the people into error:

"If there arise in the midst of thee a prophet, or one that saith he hath dreamed a dream, and he foretell a sign and wonder, and that come to pass which he spoke; and he say to thee, let us go and follow strange gods, which thou knowest not, and let us serve them; thou shalt not hear the words of that prophet or dreamer, for the Lord your God trieth you, that it may appear whether you love him with all your heart and with all your soul, or no; follow the Lord your God, and fear him, and keep his commandments, and his voice: him you shall serve, unto him you shall cleave: and that prophet or forger of dreams shall be slain, because he spoke to draw you away from the Lord your God, who brought you out of the land of Egypt and redeemed you out of the house of bondage, to make thee go out of the way which the Lord thy God commanded thee: and thou shalt take away the evil out of the midst of thee."—Deut. xiii, 1, &c.

Our Lord himself, though he performed miracles, did not *merely* refer to *them*, in proof of his mission, but to the Old Testament, to Moses, the Law, and the Prophets. I would ask, did not the performance of miracles terminate, after the Christian dispensation had been established upon earth?—Christ himself cautioned his followers against deceivers, in the following language:

"If any man shall say to you, Lo, here is Christ, or there, do not believe him; for there shall arise false Christs and false Prophets, and shall show great signs and wonders, insomuch as to deceive, if possible, even the elect: *behold, I have told it to you beforehand.*"—Matt. xxiv, 24.

Again, we are informed, that the working of signs and lying wonders, is a characteristic of the Man of Sin.

"Whose coming," the Apostle says, "is according to the working of Satan, in all power, and signs, and lying wonders, and in all seduction of iniquity to them that perish, because they received not the love of the truth, that they might be saved: therefore God shall send the operation of error to believe lying, that all may be judged who have not believed the truth, but have consented to iniquity."—2 Thess. ii, 9—11.

Again, the working of miracles is mentioned as a characteristic of one of the beasts:

"And I saw another beast coming up out of the earth, and he had two horns like a lamb, and he spoke as a dragon, and he executed all the power of the former beast in his sight, and he caused the earth and them that dwell therein, to adore the first beast, whose wound to death was healed; and he did great signs, so that he made also fire come down from heaven unto the earth in the sight of men, and he seduced them that dwell on the earth for the signs which were given him to do in the sight of the beast, saying to them that dwell on the earth, that they should make the image of the beast, which had the wound by the sword, and lived: and it was given him to give life to the image of the beast, and that the image of the beast should speak, and should cause, that whosoever would not adore the image of the beast, should be slain: and he shall make all, both little and great, rich and poor, freemen and bondmen, have a character in their right hand or on their foreheads: and that no man might buy or sell but he that hath the character or the name of the beast, or the number of his name."—Apocalypse, xiii, 12—17.

You can now determine whether, if even the reformers had been able to perform miracles, that power, *per se*, alone, would have entitled them to act as divinely commissioned.

Mr. Maguire asks, by what means religion was handed down to the time of Moses? He should remember, that the head of each family of God's people was both patriarch and priest of his own house; that the great age of those who lived before the flood, enabled them personally to communicate to their posterity divine truth; and, that their religion consisted of a few simple principles. My opponent says, that the Jewish synagogue never erred. I beg to remind him, that the Jewish *church* was of divine origin, but that the *synagogue* was of human institution. I repeat it—the synagogue was of human institution. If we refer to scripture, we find that the leaders and priests of the Israelites erred. In Exodus, xxxii, 5, we read—

"They said, these are thy Gods, O Israel, that have brought thee out of the land of Egypt. And when Aaron saw this, he built an altar before it, and made proclamation by a crier's voice, saying, 'to-morrow is the solemnity of the Lord.'"

I wonder whether Aaron is deemed to have been infallible, when he sanctioned idolatry! Again, we read the following description of the spiritual guides of Israel:

"His watchmen are all blind, they are all ignorant, dumb dogs, not able to bark, seeing vain things, sleeping and loving dreams, and most impudent dogs, they never had enough: the shepherds themselves knew no understanding: all have turned aside unto their own way, every one after his own gain, from the first even to the last. Come, let us take wine and be filled with drunkenness: and it shall be as to-day, so also to-morrow, and much more." Isaiah, lvi, 10.

In Malachi, we read,

"The lips of the priest shall keep knowledge, and they shall seek the law at his mouth, because he is the angel of the Lord of Hosts."

What follows?

"*But you are departed out of the way, and have caused many to stumble at the law, you have made void the covenant of Levi, saith the Lord of Hosts; therefore have I made you contemptible, and base before all people, as you have not kept my ways, and have accepted persons in the law.*"—*Chap. ii*, 7, 9.

So much for the infallibility of the Jewish teachers. My friend has observed, that the synagogue and ecclesiastical rulers were infallible, till Christ came, and that infallibility was then transferred to Jesus. I beg to know at what precise period the prerogative was transferred from the Jewish synagogue? Was it while the Scribes and Pharisees sat in Moses' chair, and while Jesus commanded the people to hear them? Was infallibility taken from them at that time? I have showed you from Deuteronomy, that miracles *per se*, alone, were not sufficient to prove that even the Saviour was divinely commissioned, unless he also referred to the testimony of Scripture. I would ask, was it not said of the Jewish hierarchy, "have any of the Rulers or Pharisees believed on him?—(John vii, 47.)

Mr. MAGUIRE here interrupted, and said—I told you that the synagogue did not err *de facto* until the coming of Christ, but I did not say that infallibility was conferred upon it by God.

Mr. POPE—Gentlemen, Mr. Maguire has said, that, although infallibility was not the privilege of the synagogue, yet it never erred *de facto* until Christ appeared. Now Mr. Maguire looks upon the synagogue as having been the representative of the Jewish church, and Roman Catholics, by analogy founded on the Jewish church, argue in favour of the infallibility of their own. I assert that those who believed that Jesus was the Christ, and followed the Saviour, must have done so in opposition to their rulers, and must have exercised their own *private* judgments on the proofs that Jesus was the Son of God. My friend asks, is one man to set up his judgment against many? There are

extreme cases when such a procedure may be absolutely necessary. Such occurred, when, as I have already observed, according to Vincentius Lirinensis, (Com. 1, cap. 6,) and Jerome, (in Dial. contra. Lucifer,) the whole world had become Arian. A Christian man, as Athanasius did, must at that period have stood out against the whole world. Christ selected a few to stand against the many, nor should the believer refuse to join the persecuted ranks of the followers of Jesus, though the world be against them.

In order to show that Luther was not the impetuous headstrong person, which his enemies represent him to have been, permit me to read you a passage from his writings:

"We allow that in the Papacy are many good things; and all those good things we have retained. What we affirm is this; that the Popes have in many instances corrupted the Apostolic church; and have preferred their own laws and ordinances to the laws and ordinances of Christ. Therefore, all that accumulated mass of human contrivances, which is of Satan's suggestion, and contributes to the destrucion of the church of God, rather than to its edification, we entirely disapprove and reject: but stop here. We would not imitate the man who on seeing his brother in the utmost danger of being killed by a wild boar, instantly pierced both the boar and and his brother with one thrust of his spear. Perhaps some Papists will accuse me of flattering the Pope in this instance: MY ANSWER IS; if the Pope will bear such flattery as this, I will become his obedient son; I will be a good Papist and will recant all that I have said to offend him."—Com. de Luth. ii, xl, 13, 14.

In other words, if *the errors* of the church of Rome were removed, Luther says, that he would return to her communion.

I shall also give you the opinion of a learned and grave Roman Catholic divine, which will show you, at whose door is to be laid the cause of separation. Cassander was appointed by the two emperors Ferdinand and Maximillian, to endeavour to heal the breach which had taken place between the reformed and the church of Rome. He observes,

"Yet I cannot deny, but that, in the beginning, many, out of a godly zeal and care were driven to a sharp and severe reproof of certain manifest abuses; and that *the principal cause of this calamity and distraction of the church is to be laid upon those, which being puffed up with a vain insolent conceit of their ecclesiastical power, proudly and scornfully contemned and rejected them, which did rightly and modestly admonish their reformation.* Wherefore, my opinion is, that the church can never hope for any firm peace, unless they make the beginning, which have given the cause of this distraction: that is, unless those which are in place of ecclesiatical government, will be content to remit something of their too much rigour, and yield somewhat to the peace of the church, and *hearkening unto the earnest prayers and admonitions of many godly men*, will set themselves to correct manifest abuses according *to the rule of divine scriptures, and of the ancient church from which they have swerved.*"—Consult pp. 56, 57.

My friend has told a long story about Calvin, I could relate several strange stories; for instance, about St. Anthony preaching to the fishes, and various other ludicrous anecdotes.

I beg to make an observation, relative to a passage from a Protestant writer in reference to the church of Rome being apostolic. The church of Rome, I admit, was pure in the apostolic times, when Paul addressed his epistle to her: but I now protest against her, as having departed from her great original, and as having added various doctrines and ordinances to those revealed in the sacred scripture. Mr. Maguire will, doubtless ask me, where was the church before Luther? I am prepared to answer him.

Mr. Maguire.—Mr. Pope has asserted, that the poor man is placed under worse circumstances as to making an act of faith, according to my priciples, than according to the principles which he advocates. I imagined I had satisfactorily proved that it is utterly impossible for any ignorant Protestant to make a prudent act of faith in *the inspiration of the sacred volume*, unless he were able to examine every passage, compare every text, reconcile every apparent contradiction, and be prepared to solve every doubt, and satisfy his own conscience touchng the various and multiplied objections of the Atheist, the Deist, and other infidels. Now as this is *impossible* for an *ignorant* Protestant; hence it is impossible he can make a prudent act of faith. Look, for instance, at what are called the *lies* of the patriarchs; examine the description and dimensions of Noah's ark—how would the ignorant Protestant show that two of every species of animal were contained therein, since, according to the dimensions given, two whales alone could scarcely find accommodation. On the other hand, the poor Catholic has but one simple solitary fact to ascertain, viz.—has Christ established an unerring church, with authority to teach and judge for her children. The moment this one fact has been ascertained by him, he can make an act of faith explicitly in the authority of that church, and every other article of Revelation which she proposes to his belief. He submits with certainty to the authority of that church, and he laughs to scorn the accumulated objections of the deists. He may not, I will admit, be able to solve all the doubts and difficulties collected by infidels, but he relies upon the express promises of Jesus Christ to his church, and believes in all articles which that church professes to have received from her Divine Founder.

I am surprised that Mr. Pope has never essayed to answer the questions which I put to him touching those articles of Protestant faith which are *not to be found in any part of the sacred scriptures.*

In defence of the Protestant Reformation, he quotes Dryden the poet, as an authority of mighty importance. As the gentleman deals *so largely in fiction*, I cannot blame him for having

recourse to the *evidence of the poets*. In the present instance however, he has been singularly unfortunate, for Dryden, deeply deploring that he had ever said or written any thing against the Catholic church, to which he subsequently became a convert, had recourse to the tribunal of Confession, as the ordinary means appointed by Christ to obtain forgiveness of sins. He was enjoined by his confessor to exert those rare talents which it pleased God to bestow upon him, in defence of the truth. He therefore translated the life of Francis Xavier, an Indian Roman Catholic Missionary, equally esteemed by Protestants and Catholics, not only for the extent of his missionary labours, but the simplicity purity, and self-denial which he manifested throughout his whole life. Dryden also wrote that curious poem called 'the Hind and Panther,' in which he describes the church of England as a hungry, ferocious and prowling wild beast, pursuing with open mouth and merciless avidity the Catholic church, which he denominates a spotless Hind. So much for the authority of Dryden against the doctrines of the Catholic church.

I appeal to all candid Protestants to say whether Mr. Pope has, in the remotest degree, approached the irrefragable argument which I brought forward as to the books of *scripture which have been lost*. I called upon him to say, if all the books of scripture were necessary. Supposing that he answered in the affirmative, I have proved that we have not at present *all* the books of scripture, there being full *twenty of them lost*. I then placed him in the other alternative, and called upon him to show, that a portion only of the scripture would be sufficient for salvation, and to establish his opinion by a direct and positive text of scripture. Mr. Pope has quoted a text from St. Paul, where writing to Timothy, he says, that the scriptures are "profitable to teach, to correct, to instruct in all righteousness."

Is there here a proof that your sole rule of faith is to be founded upon any *certain portion*, or upon the *whole* of the scriptures? I again repeat the question, whether or not it is necessary for salvation to know the whole scriptures, or a portion of them? and I require an answer from scripture to the question. Mr. Pope has, in the above extract, quoted St. Paul when he was writing to Timothy, who was not a layman, but a bishop and metropolitan of Asia. It was the duty of Timothy to know the holy scriptures, in order to teach them to others. Was a bishop bound to teach and instruct in the holy scriptures? If he was, was he not bound to know them?

In order to prove the scriptures to be the sole rule of faith, Mr. Pope has asserted, that the Old Testament was ordered to be read in many places. But he should recollect, that it was to be interpreted *according to the synagogue*.

No wonder a bishop is to understand the scriptures, when he is obliged to preach and expound them. Such must be the province of the bishops and clergy, or every man may assert for himself the right of preaching. I ask, in the presence of *Protestant bishops*, whether it be the right of every tinker and low ignorant mechanic to take upon them to "teach, to preach, to correct, and instruct?"

Our Saviour said, "search the scriptures." It is perfectly right to do so. The Redeemer appealed to the common sense of the Jews to decide upon the proofs of his divine mission. To what else should we appeal, but to the common sense of a man before he *recognizes authority?* I have already informed you, that every man is to employ his common sense to discover the marks of the church of Christ. But when he discovers those marks of the true church, he at once submits his judgment to her authority. Immediately after the text, "search the scriptures," as quoted by Mr. Pope, the Saviour adds, "for in them *you think* you have eternal life." This is a manifest proof, that eternal life is not to be found in them alone, otherwise Christ would not have said, "for in them *you think*."

I should much wish that the advocate of unlimited private judgment would not endeavour to force his own opinions upon others.

Mr. Pope has quoted passages from Catholic writers regarding the promoting causes of the Reformation. All allow that a reformation was required, but it was a reformation of morals and discipline, and not a change in religion. If any man will say that a reformation in the doctrines of the church of Christ was required, I shall only remind him of the words of St. Paul:

"But though I or an angel from heaven preach a gospel to you, besides that which we have preached to you, let him be anathema."

The doctrine then of the church of Christ *never was to be changed.* There was to be no other doctrine. Will it be said by my opponent that the promises of Christ to his church failed —that she fell into error—that all had become heretics, and that therefore Luther and Calvin were justified in adding to, and reforming the doctrines of the church?

The despotic conduct of the clergy proves nothing, when adduced to show that a reformation was required in doctrine. I admit that it was principally bishops and ecclesiastics who broached heresies, and erected heretical churches, and not the poor—but that only proves the danger which arises from reading and interpreting the scriptures without the due dispositions; and strongly illustrates the effects which would flow from an *indiscriminate* circulation of the sacred scriptures without note or comment. If those who had devoted their lives to the study of the scriptures, should happen to be led into error, how much

more might we expect that the poor ignorant man would, in perusing them, adopt erroneous opinions? Mr. Pope not only charges error to the account of the Catholic church, but he admits that the *church of England is wrong*, for he protests against *twenty-one out of her thirty-nine published articles of belief.* Consequently he must believe that the church of England *teaches that which is not true.* And I have no doubt but I myself am a better church of England man than my friend Mr. Pope. Mr. Pope has said that our Saviour did not come to reform the Jewish church.

Mr. POPE.—What I said was, that he came to give perfection to the Mosaic dispensation, by the establishment of the full Christian economy.

Mr. MAGUIRE.—What is perfecting a law, but reforming it? I affirm that Christ came to reform the law of Moses, as Moses reformed the religion of the patriarchs. One of the tenets of the Jewish religion was, that a man may turn away his wife, on any pretext, and take another. This, with many other points of the moral code, has been altered in the dispensation of Christ. I therefore affirm that Christ came to reform the Jewish law; and he himself tells the Jews, that if he had not done the works which he performed, those who refused to believe in him would have no sin in them.

Here our Saviour directly appeals to miracles in proof of the truth of his mission. I believe that the Son of the Almighty God performed those miracles in order that the Jewish people might have no excuse left them. Christ appealed to miracles—surely that will not be denied. Mr. Pope says that our Saviour came to restore the Mosaic law. Would God have punished the man with death who departed from that law, if he intended that such an authority should lead into error? Mr. Pope will say that the synagogue rejected Christ. I assert that the synagogue did not err till the coming of the Redeemer was proved by manifest miracles, and the mission of him established of whom Moses said,

"The Lord thy God will raise up to thee a prophet of thy nation, and of thy brethren, like unto me: hear ye *him.*"

When Christ did come, the three kings from the east, who sought him, called on Herod to know where was the promised Messiah to be found. Herod *relied not on his* private judgment; he sent to the Scribes and Pharisees who *sat in the chair of Moses*, and they all agreed it was in Bethlehem of Juda, that the Redeemer was to be born; and they quoted the words of the prophet. The Jews, therefore, who refused to believe in Christ had no excuse; they were inexcusable for not believing in his

mission, respecting which all the predictions of the prophets concurred. I have proved to you that Christ reformed the Jewish religion; but I do not say that he introduced a perfectly new religion. As our Saviour then appealed to miracles when he came to reform the law of Moses, we are justly entitled to call for miracles on the part of Luther and Calvin, who pretended that they came to reform our church, which had continued from the days of Christ for fifteen hundred years. Will it be said by any man, that the reformers of the sixteenth century, referred to miracles in proof of their mission?

I call upon Mr. Pope to produce any Catholic historian of established credit, who admits that any other reformation was required than that of morals and discipline. Erasmus, who wrote more licentiously on that subject than any other Catholic with whose works I am acquainted, did admit a reformation in morals and discipline—but *decidedly not in doctrine.* I insist that I have established the fact, that till the coming of Christ, the Jewish synagogue did not err in doctrine; or, in other words, that it was infallible.—Our Saviour says to his disciples—

"The Scribes and Pharisees have sat in the chair of Moses. All, therefore, whatsoever they shall say to you, OBSERVE AND DO; but according to their work do ye not."

Here our divine Lord, though about to introduce a more perfect dispensation, refers his disciples to the authority of the established teachers, until he had revealed the object of his mission. Did the *soi-disant* reformers do so? Christ, therefore, referred the Jews to the existing authorities, nor did he *recall that advice till he had established his own church on the basis of innumerable miracles.* Christ also gave to his Apostles the power of working miracles, in order to the diffusion and establishment of his church on earth. I suppose Mr. Pope will admit that miracles were wrought in the primitive church. As to the argument which he deduced from the conduct of some Popes, I have already shown to you that there is a wide difference between doctrines of faith and morality, between infallibility and impeccability. The Apostle Peter sinned, but he could not err in faith, for he was inspired. Infallibility is the attribute of the body of the church *in globo*—it does not exist in the individual members, but in the *collective body* of the faithful. There are many qualities which belong to the *body corporate*, and which are not found in the individuals composing that body. For example, the vote of a single individual in Parliament avails nothing, but the votes of the collective body, form the law of the land.

Mr. Pope says, that Aaron is to be charged with the worship of the golden calf—I did not say, that Aaron was infallible—but I affirm, that Moses was a greater authority than Aaron

Aaron had only an ordinary—Moses an extraordinary mission When Moses was speaking with God on the mountain, he interceded with the Almighty for the Israelites, and prevailed upon God to forgive them. He prayed to God if he should not forgive them, to blot his name out of the book of life. God did forgive them, and remitted in a wonderful measure the punishment decreed against them.

Our divine Lord came to establish an authority above that of the Jewish synagogue, and he performed miracles to give an undoubted assurance to his mission. John the Baptist referred to the miracles which he knew Christ would perform, and Christ appealed to the prophecies of John the Baptist. This perhaps will be called by Mr. Pope a *circulus vitiosus*, and yet he cannot doubt the reality of the miracles of Christ. My reverend opponent has asked whether the Scribes and Pharisees, who sat in the chair of Moses, did not oppose Christ? Certainly—but it remains to be shown, that *they publicly condemned Christ* until their authority was *superseded by a greater authority* sent from God, Christ Jesus his Son.

Mr. Pope has referred to the times of the Arians, and has quoted St. Jerome, as saying the world was astonished to find itself Arian at once. I admit this hyperbole on the part of St. Jerome; but it is one that can be easily explained. Liberius, Mr. Pope informs us, signed the confession of Sirmium. Dr. Cave, a greater man than Mr. Pope, in his Life of Athanasius, declares that it is not known whether it was the confession at Sardica or Sirmium, which was signed by Pope Liberius. Now, as it is a matter of historical doubt, which Mr. Pope himself cannot clear up, and which the learned Dr. Cave was unable to decide, am I not at liberty to doubt, whether Liberius signed either the one or the other? But admitting the fact, I deny that it necessarily follows, that Liberius became an Arian. I believe I can easily show, that the very reverse is true. Liberius, a good and pious man, according to Dr. Cave, was banished into Thrace by the Arian emperor, because he refused to sign a formulary of faith which had been previously subscribed by the Sirmium bishops. In this state of exile he continued for two years, suffering such hardships and privations as our modern saints would scarcely endure. He was at length permitted to return, if we may believe Theodoret, at the intercession of the Roman ladies, who, making a very imposing appearance, waited upon the emperor, as he entered their city, and obtained his consent, that their venerated pontiff should return to the discharge of his duties. Granting, I say, that at his return he was prevailed upon to sign the Sirmium confession, it remains for Mr. Pope to show that this confession *was Arian.*

Now, I affirm, in the face of a learned body of men, that the formulary subscribed by the bishops at Sirmium was *purely orthodox*; and that the only objection to it was, that it did not contain the word ομουσιον, which was introduced at the council of Nice. But in all other respects it condemned and anathematised the *Arian heresy*, as may be seen by the most superficial observer, by glancing over the confession itself. Liberius, therefore, might justly conclude that the word ομουσιον was not essential to our orthodox formulary of faith, especially as it was wholly unknown to antiquity. The Arians, finding that this formulary had been signed by many truly orthodox bishops, immediately cried out, that the Catholic prelates gave their solemn sanction to Arianism. The people who were not present, but who had heard of the subscription, were alarmed and astonished at the reports so industriously circulated; and hence St. Jerome used that well-known expression, that the whole world was astonished to find itself Arian. But the falsehoods of the Arians were shortly detected, and the faithful restored to confidence and peace. So much for the hyperbole of the great and good St. Jerome.

Mr. Pope.—Gentlemen: as to Pope Liberius, Dupin, to whom I have already alluded, admits, that it is doubtful whether he subscribed *the first or second confession of Sirmium*; but there is no question as to his having signed the condemnation of Athanasius, (2 vol. p. 62, 1697, 3d. ed. Lond. fol.) From his letter as given in Baronius and Hilary, it is evident that he ratified the sentence passed by the Arians against Athanasius.—Baron. Tom. i, p. 939, ad. ann. 257, No 46, Mayence, 1601.—Liberius's letter is given in the fragm. of St. Hilary, vi,—Ex. oper. Hist. p. 1335, Benedict. edit. I ask my friend, if a Christian man, in the days of Liberius, was not called upon to stand alone against the whole word? Mr. Maguire has stated that, according to my principles, the poor man is in a worse condition, than if *his* principles were adopted. He remarked, that if he could prove to the poor man the infallibility of his church, all his difficulties would immediately vanish? I reply, that in order to induce the poor man to believe that the church of Rome is infallible, Mr. Maguire must appeal to the Bible: and if the poor man should make objections to the inspired records, Mr. Maguire must explain to him every difficulty with which he may happen to charge the sacred page; so that my opponent must convince him, that the Bible is the book of God, before he can possibly succeed in proving that the church of Rome is infallible. As to the poor Protestant who has received the knowledge of divine truth, though he may not be able to

explain every difficulty, yet is he convinced that the sacred scriptures have proceeded from heaven, because he himself has experienced in his own soul their sanctifying influence, and has the witness to their truth in himself. In the passage relative to Timothy's having known the scriptures, Mr. Maguire has omitted the words, "that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto every good work." Now, I would ask, was Timothy a clergyman while a child? Was he a learned divine when he was a little boy? Was he like those which we have heard described, beardless boys, exercising spiritual jurisdiction in the church of Rome, and arrogating authority over the bodies and souls of men? Timothy read the Old Testament scriptures—a *fortiori* the scriptures of the New Testament should be read; for, confessedly, the Old Testament is the more difficult portion of the sacred volume. If St. Paul commends Timothy, that "from a child," "απο βρεφους," he knew the scriptures, does not this fact supply us with an argument for placing the inspired records in the hands of the young? But I must not forget that Mr. Maguire has said, that Timothy read the scriptures, as they were interpreted by the synagogue. Permit me to observe, that if Timothy had understood the scripture according to the interpretation of the synagogue, he would have rejected the Messiah!

My friend's comment on the words "in them *you think* you have eternal life," is evidently at variance with the object which the Saviour had in view in making the observation: he intended to charge the Jews with practical inconsistency:—"Ye search the scriptures—in those scriptures ye believe that eternal life is contained, and they are they which testify of me, and yet, notwithstanding, ye will not come unto me, that ye may have life." Mr. Maguire has acknowledged, that a moral reformation was called for in the church of Rome, but says that I could not prove from Roman Catholic authorities, that a reformation in doctrine was required. It is altogether unreasonable to expect, that such an acknowledgement should be found in Roman Catholic divines. They judged according to their own standard of faith; and if they were consistent, they could not reject any doctrine advocated by the authority of their church.

Cassander, indeed, remarks, in the passage already referred to, that

"Ecclesiastics should set themselves, to correct manifest abuses according *to the rule of divine scriptures, and the primitive church,* FROM WHICH THEY HAVE SWERVED."—Consult. pp. 56, 57.

Mr. Maguire has again said, no man can reform the church of Christ without performing miracles. He has again begged the question, by identifying the church of Rome with the church

of Christ. This day her doctrines have been contrasted with those contained in the sacred volume, and you will decide whether they accord. My opponent has observed that the Saviour stated, that the Scribes and Pharisees sat in Moses's seat, and that he exhorted the people to hear them. But I would ask, were they, therefore, infallible? Let any man examine the gospels, and he will find that the outcry and opposition against the Redeemer were principally raised by them. They were to be heard, while reading the books of Moses, but not when uttering their own traditions, which the Saviour so pointedly condemned. The Jesuit Maldonate explains the passsage in the same way; indeed, it cannot with any possibility be otherwise expounded—

"When Christ (saith he) bids observe, and do what the Scribes and Pharisees say, while they sit in Moses' seat, he speaks not of their doctrine, but of the doctrine of the law, and of Moses. For it is, as if he should say, all things that the law and Moses shall say unto you, the Scribes and Pharisees rehearsing it, observe and do, but after their works do not."—Mald. ad Matt. xxiii. 23.

Mr. Maguire has adduced the opinion of Erasmus—now, as he died a Roman Catholic, Mr. Maguire will, perhaps, admit his opinion of Luther as a theologian:

"There is more sound theology in one passage of his (Luther's) commentaries than in many large volumes of the schoolmen and other such writers." And again,

"I am more instructed and edified by one page of Luther, than by the whole work of Aquinas."

My opponent has remarked, that friars and priests by their learning became the authors of heresies. I would ask, is it the wish of my opponent that none should be learned, because learning has been abused? I repeat a former observation, if the abuse of the scriptures furnish a reason on account of which they should be withheld from any portion of mankind, *they should be taken from priests and friars, who have perverted them, and given to the people who have never abused them.* My friend has told us, that Christ came to reform the church. He came to give a fuller developement to revealed truth. The shadows of the Mosiac dispensation were to flee away, and the rays of divine light, which had pointed to Christ, were now to be concentrated in him, as the sun of the system. The reformers, on the other hand, were not to unfold a fuller dispensation, but to return to original principles. It was their's to remove the rubbish which nearly overwhelmed the edifice of truth, and to lay it open to our view in the beauty of its original proportions. To employ an illustration, which has elsewhere been used—suppose a number of individuals had bound themselves by certain laws, a copy of which was hung up for the view of the persons who composed the society. Abuses nowever grad-ally

crept in, and the larger portion of the members succeeded in removing the table of laws. Should not the minority demand that the code of regulations should be again produced, and that the system should be modelled afresh by the standard of rectitude and truth? Mr. Maguire has again introduced the doctrine of infallibility. Suppose that I should grant for a moment, for argument's sake, that a man is convinced that the church of Rome is infallible, (though I am most thoroughly persuaded that no infallible tribunal exists) of what benefit can the supposed infallibility of the church of Rome be to her votaries, if the instrument or medium of conveying its decrees to them be not infallible also? The priest, in the interpretation of decrees and councils, must distinguish between what is to be rejected and what is to be received, and, if not infallible, may himself err. And, again, the individual to whom the priest addresses himself, may, if not infallible, misconceive his meaning, even though the priest should deliver the mind of his church aright. Mr. Maguire has referred to the Old Testament, to prove that disobedience to the voice of the priest was punished with death. My opponent should remember, that in Judea the law of God was the law of the land, Moses having delivered as well the political as the moral law to the chosen people of God. The Jewish priesthood were specially set apart for the study of that which at once was the religious and the civil polity of the Jews. In difficult cases the magistrate therefore appealed to their opinion, and their verdict decided the question. Government invests its judges with authority to put to death: we do not argue that they are consequently infallible. Though it be distinctly written, "the powers that be are ordained of God, and he that resisteth, shall receive to himself damnation," (Rom. xiii, 1,) it does not follow, that "the powers that be," are infallible. As to Herod's appeal to the priests, we may suppose that he was not acquainted with the prophecies. Did the Jewish teachers merely offer their own opinion on the subject of his inquiry? No, they referred to the words of the prophet.

[And applied them, observed Mr. Maguire.]

Mr. Maguire has talked of the miracles of Xavier. I suppose that they may be paralleled with one recorded by a cardinal. We are told—

"As St. Anthony was disputing concerning the truth of the Lord's body in the Eucharist with a heretic, the heretic required of Anthony this sign: Saya the heretic, "I have a mule, to which I shall give no meat these three days. After the three day's end, come thou with the sacrament, and I will come with my mule, and will pour out provender before it; if the mule leave his provender, and come and venerate the sacrament, I will believe.' These conditions were accepted, and after three days, St. Anthony approached, bringing the sacrament. The mule forgetting his provender and his hunger,

went forthwith towards the hand of sainted Anthony!!"—Bellarmine de Sacram. Euchar. lib. iii, cap. 8, prope finem.

In reference to laymen, I would suggest to my friend, that in speaking of the superiority of Moses to Aaron, he should bear in mind that Moses was a layman. We are told that Moses interceded for the people, so did Paul; but though while they were on earth, they did so, does it follow that they do so now in heaven; if, while they could be seen, and while men could in person request them to pray in their behalf, they complied with their solicitations, does it follow that they pray for us now in heaven, or can hear our petitions there. I did not say that our Saviour did not refer to his miracles; I stated that he appealed to the written word, as well as to his works, and not exclusively to the latter. I am asked, where was the church of Christ before the Reformation? I answer, the church of Christ is not confined to any one denomination. I hope that even now some of its members are to be found in the church of Rome: but I would say to any such that may remain within her pale,

"Come out of her, my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues."—Apocalypse, xviii, 4.

The members of Christ's body were found protesting against the church of Rome long before the Reformation—the Wickliffites in England, and the Bohemians and the Waldenses abroad. We shall show, upon Roman Catholic testimony, that the principles of the Reformation were only the tenets of the Waldenses *revived*. Ecchius reproached Luther with renewing the heresies of the Waldenses. Lindanus, Roman Catholic bishop of Ghent, (1650,) terms Calvin "the inheritor of the doctrine of the Waldenses." Mezeray, the celebrated historiographer of France, in his abridgment of Chronology, says—"The Waldenses held nearly the same opinions as those who are now called Calvinists."

Let us now determine the antiquity of the Waldenses upon Roman Catholic authority. Reinerius Saccho, an inquisitor, and the most inveterate enemy of the Waldenses, gives the following account of them:

"Inter omnes has sectas, quæ adhuc sunt, vel fuerunt, non est perniciosior ecclesiæ quam Leonistarum; et hoc tribus de causis; prima est, quia est diuturnior; alique enim dicunt, quod duravit á tempore Sylvestri; aliqui á tempore Apostolorum. Secunda, quia est generalior; fere enim nulla est terra, in quâ hæc secta non est. Tertia, quia cum omnes aliæ sectæ, immanitate blasphemiarum in Deum, audientibus horrorem inducunt, hæc magnum habet speciem pietatis, eò quod coram hominibus justi vivant, et bene omnia de Deo credant, et omnes articulos qui in symbolo continentur; solummodo Romanum Ecclesiam blasphemant et clerum."

"Among all the sects (there were sects, you perceive, before the Reformation,) which still are, or have been, there is not one more pernicious to the church than that of the Leonites; (a name by which the Waldenses were

sometimes called) and that for three reasons. The first is, because it is the oldest, for some say it hath endured from the time of Pope Silvester; others, from *the time of the Apostles*. The second, because it is more general, for there is scarce any country where this sect is not. The third, because when all other sects beget horror by their blasphemies against God, this of the Leonites hath a great show of piety, because they live justly before men, and believe all things rightly concerning God, and all the articles contained in the creed."

What then was the head and front of their offending? Reinerius adds,

"Only they blaspheme the church of Rome and the clergy."—(Rein. Saccho. edit. Gretzer, O. S. J. cap. iv, p. 54.)

I shall lay before you another testimony. When some cardinals and prelates accused the Waldenses in Merindol and Cabriers, of grievous crimes, and urged Lewis XII, to root them out; the Waldenses, having notice thereof, sent their deputies to his majesty to declare their innocence. The prelates were instant upon the king, not to give them any audience; but the king answered, that if he were to make war against the Turk, he would previously hear him. The king accordingly sent Adam Fume, his master of requests, and doctor Parvi, his confessor, to search and inquire both into their life and religion. The commissioners visited those places, and upon their return, reported to the king the result of their examination, namely—

"That men were baptized—the articles of faith, and the ten commandments were taught—the Lord's day observed—the word of God preached, and no show of wickedness or fornication to be perceived amongst them: but that they found not any images in their churches, nor any ornaments belonging to the mass."

The king hearing this report of the commissioners, said, (and he bound it with an oath) "*That they were better men than he, or the rest of his Catholic subjects.*"

"Tumrex etiamsi, inquit, nihi in Turcam aut diabolum bellum suscipiendum esset cos tamen prius audire vellem."—Wesembecii Oratio de Valdens, p. 418, extat in Joach. Camerarii Histor. Narrations de Fratrum. Orthod. Eccl in Bohemia.

"Illi ad regem referunt, illis in locis homines baptizari, articulos fidei et decalogum doceri, dominicos dies religiosè coli, Dei verbum exponi, veneficia et stupra apud eos nulla esse. His auditis rex, Jurejunando addito, me, inquit, et cetero populo meo Catholico meliores illi viri sunt."—Ibid. p. 419.

"Ceterum se in ipsorum templis neque imagines neque ornamenta miseria reperisse."—Ibid.

When, therefore, I am asked, where was your religion before the days of Luther, though I might point to the Bible and answer "in the Bible,"—as God did not leave himself without witnesses, I can refer to the Waldenses, and trace their origin up to a period, when, comparatively speaking, the church was in a state of purity. Faber, in his Difficulties of Romanism, has challenged any Roman Catholic divine, undertaking to show from

the early Fathers, that the doctrines of the primitive church were in accordance with the doctrines of Protestantism.

I have called upon my friend to bring forward his proofs against the justification of the Reformation—NOW, perhaps, we shall have a flourish of trumpets. I have stated, that the separation was imperatively called for by the moral debasement and unscriptural doctrines of the church of Rome—still I would say come to the question; disprove, Mr. Maguire, if you can, the immoral condition of the church of Rome, and the unscriptural character of her doctrines. On these grounds, I repeat, the reformers were justified in separating from her communion; show that they were not justified in that separation. I am convinced that you will not be able to do so. Then let the empire give in its verdict, that the Reformation was called for by the moral degradation, and by the anti-scriptural doctrines of the church of Rome.

Mr. MAGUIRE.—Mr. Pope has talked of a challenge published by a Mr. Faber. I imagined they had not a greater man to produce on the other side than Mr. Pope himself; and when I joined issue with him, I supposed that I had to contend against the best advocate of their cause. I may remark, that I have not stood up here for the infallibility of the Pope. If Liberius did sign the confession of Sirmium, which Mr. Pope has not proved, it was on being freed from long confinement, and from suffering. Mr. Pope has not extricated himself from the dilemma in which I involved him, as to the power of an ignorant Protestant to make an act of faith upon the inspiration of the scriptures. How can the Protestant free himself from doubts? He has no means of solving all the difficulties connected with the scriptures. He must remove them through the instrumentality of private judgment, or be a deist, or an atheist. When I produced the authority of the holy Fathers of the early ages, to prove that the Bible is the word of God, I did not contradict my principles; but Mr. Pope violates his principles, when he adduces authority to satisfy the doubting Protestant. I have put certain queries to Mr. Pope, and I cannot prevail upon him even to *attempt an answer to them.* Mr. Pope has talked of the Son of God having left the perfect scriptures to man. I have to complain, that Mr. Pope puts into my mouth doctrines, which I by no means entertain. I consider that the scriptures, as far as they go, contain a rule and system of perfect morality. The scriptures I study and revere: but I abhor the principle which would convert the scriptures into *instruments* of infidelity. I maintain, that we should not be allowed to abuse those scriptures which Christ left to his church. Christ did not leave them to be interpreted

the varying and capricious judgment of each individual, but to be read according to the interpretation of his church. Every man possesses a divine right to read the scriptures in the three languages in which they were originally written, viz; Hebrew, Greek, and Latin. These were the channels through which the pure scriptures were transmitted. But is a man to adopt the translations of Luther, of Calvin, and of other heretical reformers? Or does it follow that the same divine right to read the scriptures in the originals, can be transferred to *varying* and *variable* translations? I could prove that Œcolampadius corrupted the scriptures in more than one thousand places. Again, if Luther and Calvan were justified in their conduct, the same principle would justify Arius, Cerinthus, Eutychius, Manicheus, Montanus, the Muggletonians, &c, &c. The same principle would justify Mr. Pope in reforming the church of England—taking away twenty-one out of her thirty-nine articles, demolishing her spiritual authority, abolishing her prelates and pastors (whose succession is derived from the church which Protestants refuse to acknowledge) and, in fine, a similar principle would justify Mr. Pope in tearing up the church of England by the roots. But it would be an endless task, to endeavour to enumerate the sects and divisions to which that principle has given, and must continue to give origin. These endless sects were well described by Bossuet, in his History of the Protestant Variations. He says, "The raging sea is not furrowed by more waves, nor does the uncultivated land produce more thistles and thorns, than the Reformation has produced religions, since the epoch of its introduction."

If the principle, that every man has a right to reform the church be once proclaimed, a reformation of the church of England will necessarily follow. It will be soon discovered that she can be approximated to a more perfect standard of evangelical perfection—I, by the same principle may commence reformer of the church of England, by asserting that her scriptures are not all pure, and I may strike off several books from the canonical list, and would I not have as clear and as undoubted a right to do so, as Mr. Pope has to reject what he calls the Apocrypha. In fine, if one man rejected one part, and another another part, would not the consequence be, that the *whole Bible* would become *questionable* at last.

Mr. Pope talks of some loose and immoral characters, members of the Roman Catholic church. Have I not forborne to to mention a quondam Protestant Bishop of Waterford, and another bishop of *more recent notoriety*.

Suppose I proclaim a complete reformation of the church of England, what right would Mr. Pope possess to call me to an

account? I would say, that her rich, and gorgeous, and pampered hierarchy, ill accorded with the doctrines of the humble Redeemer—I would say, that in this country particularly, she took every thing from the poor, and gave them nothing in return. Would Mr. Pope call me to order? Every man according to his principles, has a right to preach. Here is Mr. Pope himself almost a layman, teaching and preaching to ecclesiastics.

I shall now give you Luther's character as drawn by himself He sketches his own portrait in better and truer colours, I fancy and more to the life, than if he had sat for it to the best literary limner in existence. I have here the German text, and it is from the translation of it, I shall select the following passages:

"I, Martin Luther, as to those matters (matters of faith) am, and wish to be deemed obstinate, contumacious, and violent; and let this be my creed, I yield to no man."

"I am a doctor above all doctors, and an unworthy evangelist of our Lord Jesus Christ. I, Martin Luther, by the grace of God, evangelist of Wittembergh. I, Doctor Martin Luther, am your Apostle, I am a prophet, I am Isaiah, to the honour of God and to the confusion of the devil. A second John the Baptist—a great hero—a most rare man—such as has not existed for many ages—I am a saint of God. MY MOUTH IS THE MOUTH OF CHRIST—I AM NOT FAR FROM THINKING MYSELF A GOD!!"

"May thunder and lightning—hell's fire and brimstone, plagues, and every dirty and filthy evil fall upon the two twins of the devil, the Pope and his cardinals."

He calls Henry the eighth of England,

"A fool"—"a madman"—"a lunatic"—a monster of insanity"—"an ass"—"a hog"—"a log"—"a knave"—"a devil"—"an imp"—"a robber."

He calls Henry, Duke of Brunswick,

"A buffoon"—"a blackguard"—"an idiot"—"a lecher"—and "an effeminate."

He sacrilegiously added the word "only" to the text of St. Paul, respecting justification by faith; and when upbraided with the corruption, he replied,

"If any papist shall start up against this word *only*, immediately oppose him the will of Dr. Martin Luther, who asserts that the Pope and an ass are one and the same thing, (quid unum et idem) and who is a doctor above all Popes and doctors."

Again, he says,

"In studying the scriptures, follow this rule—if you perceive any command in the scriptures about performing good works, understand such command to *be a prohibition against the performance of good works*, for this reason, that every man is incapable of doing a good work."

Again, of these words of Christ to his Apostles—"Ye are the light of the world." Luther makes the following version—vos estis stircus in laterna—"Ye are filth in a lantern." Again,

"Christ in the hearts of papists, is nothing but a mere fiction—a pagan idol. He who believes in Christ will be damned according to papists. If Christ be truly Christ, then monks and nuns cannot be Christians."

"In two years' time, my gospel will be so diffused, tha the Pope, and his bishops, and priests, and monks, and nuns, and bells, and towers, and cells, and the mass, will be no more heard of; in short, there will be an end of Popery altogether."

"A pious man sinneth in every good work. A GOOD WORK, NO MATTER HOW WELL PERFORMED, IS, NEVERTHELESS, A DEADLY SIN. He who believeth, can neither be a sinner, nor an adulterer. I find nothing pure or holy either in myself, or in all mankind, and all our good works are like lice or an old skin."

To his wife Catherine, whom he seduced from her three vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience, he says,

"As it is not in my power, who am a man, to become a woman, nor in your power, who art a woman, to become a man; so neither is it in my power to do without a woman, nor in your's to do without a man."

As to his contradictory doctrines, the following are a few, out of many hundred specimens:

"I believe in purgatory, and I know it to be true that souls are tortured there, and may be relieved by prayers, fasting, and alms."

And in another place, he says,

"I confidently assert that purgatory, with all its ceremonies and mimic worship, is a diabolical crime, as being diametrically opposed to that cardinal article, that the salvation of souls rests upon the merits of Christ, and not of men."

Again, he says,

"Whoever preaches against the doctrine of pontifical indulgences, let him be accursed." And—

"The indulgences which are practised in the Roman church are execrable frauds."

"Above all things it is necessary, and the scripture itself plainly teaches, that God wishes all *vows to be fulfilled*." Again—

"I wish I could persuade all mankind that all vows of whatsoever description, should be despised, and that every person should enjoy the liberty of the gospel."

"Let us abstain from all sins, but in particular from all *good works*, for all the *good works* we *perform are dead*."

"It is impossible for us to resist the *highest temptation to sin*, and the scripture itself teaches that we are slaves of the devil, and as it were the subjects of God our prince."

"*A vow of chastity* is *worse* than *adultery* and *impurity*."

"It is not so much my desire to demonstrate how chastity is to be observed, but that it is impossible, and ought not to be observed."

"If any one shall correct you for speaking smuttily, let this be your reply —What then? If the whole world be offended, we must obey necessity."

"If Huss was a heretic, I will be ten times a greater one."

"I am often in doubt whether I teach the truth or not."

"This thing (the Reformation) neither commenced on God's account, nor will it end on God's account.

He had also the sacrilegious audacity to corrup the Apostles creed, where, instead of "I believe the Catholic church," he substitutes, "I believe the Christian church," well judging that he had no claim to Catholicity

He also confesses, that he eat a bushel of salt with the devil—that he slept oftener with him than with his wife Catherine—that when he had not the devil appended about his neck, he was a mere dry theologian.—Vide Le Roy Labyrintho, cap. 13, et ipsum Lutherum, de Missa Angulari, Colloquia mensalia, et Tomun—7 vol. 228.

If the foregoing extracts from Luther's works be genuine, and I challenge inquiry on the subject, I put this single question—would the Almighty and all-wise God employ such an instrument to reform his church?

Again in his book *De Missa Privata*, (von der Winckelmesz,) he acknowledges and describes at large his famous conference with the devil, in which he confesses to have been prevailed upon by his satanic majesty to abrogate private masses—the arguments employed by the devil were five in number. The work in which this conference is to be found, was written in German by Luther's own hand, and translated into Latin at Luther's own request, by Justus Jonas. See also Tanner in his Anatomy of Luther.

Such, Gentlemen, were the doctrines of this arch-reformer, and Protestant Apostle, derived, if we can believe himself, from the devil, the father of lies. My learned friend *sometimes* differs from Luther—Luther from my learned friend—which of them will you follow?

Luther thus, thrasonically, expresses himself elsewhere—

"Here I stand—here I sit—here I remain—here I boast—here I triumph—here I insult the papists, the Thomists, the Henrycists, the Sophists, and all the gates of hell—yea, and all the words of men, no matter how sanctified. The divine Majesty has enabled me to set at nought a thousand Augustin's, a thousand Cyprians, though they should stand up against me."

The two following brief quotations from Luther I dare not translate:

"Qui Diabolum novit Confidenter ei dicit, *lambe*, mihi nates;—crepitus ventris longius fugat Diabolum quam sacra scriptura!!"

The above are to be seen by any inquirer in the original German.

Dr. Heylin, a most learned Protestant historian, gives the following account of the introduction of the new Lutheran doctrines into Dantzick (in his Cosmogony, p. 148:)

"Dantzick was the first town in the kingdom of Poland which gave entrance to the doctrines of Luther, Anno 1525, but in so tumultuous a manner, that they who favoured his opinions, deposed the old common-council men, and created new ones of their own—*prophaned the Churches*, robbed them of their ornaments, and shamefully abused the priests and religious persons—abolished the mass—and altered all things at their pleasure. But by the coming of the King, they grew somewhat quieter, leaving the convent of Black Friars to two nuns, who still enjoy the exercise of their religion."

The same writer says, (Ibidem, Book II, page 36.)

"Whilst the Lutherans were thus playing their game, there started up another party, begun at first by Zuinglius, amongst the Switzers. These, not communicating councils, went two different ways, especially in the points of consubstantiation and the real presence. Not reconciled in their times, nor like to be agreed upon by their followers. For Calvin, rising into the esteem and place of Zuinglius, added some texts of his own to the former doctrines, touching predestination, free-will, &c, by which the differences were widened, and the breach made irreparable: this course being followed on each side with great impatience, as if they did not strive so much for *truth as victory.*"

Again, the same writer says, (page 136.)

"In the year 1528, religion being altered, in a tumult of the people in the Canton of Berne, near adjoining to Geneva, Viret and Farrellus, two Zuinglian preachers, did endeavour it in Geneva also. But finding that the bishop and clergy did not like their doings, they screwed themselves into the people, and by their aid, in a popular tumult, compelled the bishop and his clergy to abandon the town. Nor did they only in that tumult alter the *doctrine* and *orders* of the church before established, but changed the government of the state also, disclaiming all allegiance both to duke and bishop, and standing on *their own liberty* as a free commonwealth. And though all this was done by Viret and Farrellus, before Calvin's coming to that city, which was not till 1536, yet, being come, no man *was forwarder than he to approve the action.* And that rather than their discipline should not be admitted, and the episcopal government destroyed in all the churches of Christ, they were resolved to *devose kings, ruin kingdoms,* and to subvert the *fundamental constitution of all civil states.*"

It cannot be inappropriate to give a short account of these principal reformers. Luther was taken suddenly ill after eating a hearty supper, and died in the night. Zuinglius was killed in a rebellion excited by himself and his party, against the Catholic cantons, anno 1531. Œcolampadius was found dead in his bed, before Luther met his fate; the latter did not hesitate to declare, that he was strangled by the devil.—(Lib. de Miss. Priv. et Unit. Sacr. Tome vii, p. 250.) Calvin, in the year 1564, died of a dreadful complication of distempers, which Catholics and some Protestants assure us he bore so ill, that he expired in despair, blaspheming God, and invoking the devils. See Bolseck, in his book of Calvin's Life.—Schlusselburgh, a learned Lutheran, in Theol. Calviniana, printed anno 1594, p. 72.—Herenius, a Calvinistic preacher, declares, that he was an eye witness of Calvin's tragical end, and that he died in despair, of a most filthy and stinking disease.—See his Liber. de vita Calvini.

The following testimony is given by Melancthon to the character of the reformers. It is taken from his Commentary on St. Matt. 6th ch.

"It is plain, that in these countries (he speaks of the countries which embraced Luther's reformation) men's whole concern is almost about banqueting, drunkenness, and carousing. And so strangely barbarous is the people, that most men are persuaded that if they do but fast one day, they must die the following night."

So you perceive, gentlemen, fasting was not then exploded. I may remark, in reference to some arguments of Mr. Pope on the subject, that the Albigenses and Waldenses retained to the last the sacrifice of the Mass. They, therefore, cannot be legitimately numbered amongst the reformers. I could quote many foul and scandalous passages from the works of Calvin and other reformers, in proof of the happy improvement in morals and religion, which they introduced by throwing off the yoke of what they called a superstition, and giving full scope to the licentious and desolating principles of the Reformation.

Jacobus Andreas (in Luke 21) says,

"The other part of the Germans, viz; the Protestants, give due place to the preaching of the word of God; but no amendment of manners is found among them; on the contrary, we see them lead an abominable *voluptuous beastly life*; instead of fasts, they spend whole nights and days in revelry and drunkenness."

Cranmer was a good example of the celibacy of the reformers—he brought his wife over with him in a chest to England, but through a mistake in the landing it, the sailors turned up the wrong end of the chest; the consequence was, that its fair inmate was forced to cry out for relief, and the hypocrital husband was obliged to expose her to the public view. I have many other quotations here; as to the character of the modern reformers, but I find I have not time at present to read them to you.

Fifth Day—Tuesday, April 24.

SUBJECT.—"*The doctrine of Transubstantiation.*"

Admiral Oliver and John Dillon, Esq., in the Chair.

Mr. Pope.—I beg to call upon Mr. Maguire for proofs of the doctrine of Transubstantiation.

Mr. Maguire.—Gentlemen, as it was agreed upon yesterday, not to recur to the question of the Reformation, I shall at once proceed to the very important subject of this day's discussion—namely, Transubstantiation. It is a question of the most solemn complexion, and I trust that although my friend Mr. Pope will be obliged, by his established principles to differ from me on this occasion, that he will indulge in no useless and profane sarcasms against a doctrine which I shall prove to have been openly established for eighteen hundred years. I sincerely trust, that in the course of this day's discussion, my friend will

not make use of any expression, which would be, according to my principles, an absolute blasphemy against the Son of God. If the doctrine which I undertake to defend be that which was *preached* by the Apostles and received by them from Christ, then it would be manifest blasphemy to utter any sarcasm against this great and fundamental *tenet*. Before I enter upon my direct proofs, I shall beg leave to draw your attention to one important fact. We are told that Melchisedech, a priest of the Most High, 'made an offering of bread and wine;" and St. Paul assures us that Christ "was a high priest *for ever according to the order of Melchesidech*." Now, if the same offering or sacrifice be not continued till the consummation of ages, Christ could not be a priest *for ever* according to the order of Melchesidech. I could prepare your minds with further prefatory observations, but the dogma which I maintain is so clear and so sustainable, that I proceed at once to my direct arguments.

First, then, I refer you to the sixth chapter of St. John, where our Saviour draws a comparison between the bread which he promised to bequeath for the life of the world and the manna which came down from heaven to feed the distressed Israelites.

"The bread (said he) that I will give you, is my flesh for the life of the world. Your Fathers did eat manna in the desert, and are dead; if any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever."

Our Redeemer here extols what he was about to give at his last supper, far beyond the bread which we know descended from heaven. Now, in my mind, the latter would have been far superior to the former, if our Saviour had left us nothing but *a bit of bread and a drop of wine*. Many of those who were present, and some of them his disciples, were shocked at the expression, and they asked how was it possible that he could give them his flesh to eat? What was the conduct then of our Lord who came to instruct all unto salvation, and who neither could deceive nor be deceived? Instead of representing to them their mistake or correcting their error, if it were one, he says,

"Amen, Amen, I say unto you; unless you eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his blood, you shall not have life in you."

At this, many of his disciples who followed him through all dangers and persecutions, all those who were about him from Capernaum *went back*, and *walked no longer with him*. Would he, the benign and beneficent Jesus, who had descended upon earth to lead man from sin, and who was about to offer himself upon the cross for man's redemption, would he suffer those persons to depart, believing that he spoke of a reality, and not explain to them their error, if indeed, it were an error? Would he have suffered them to fall innocently into error, when he could have so easily corrected their misapprehension? I ask any

easonable man, had not the people of Capernaum, in whose vernacular language (the Syriac) our Lord then spoke, a better opportunity of knowing the *meaning of the words of our Saviour* on this occasion, than we who live at the distance of eighteen hundred years, whose habits and language are confessedly different? When our Lord declared, "the bread that I will give is my flesh for the life of the world," they then understood Jesus to speak of *real flesh* and *real blood;* and accordingly they *walked no longer with him.* He did not correct their error, if such it were. What more easy for him than to say, (if that were his meaning) that he did not intend to give them his real flesh and blood—that he only spoke in a figurative sense? But Jesus made no such correction. If it were not his real body and blood of which Christ then spoke, he led those people into error: but that supposition is manifest blasphemy. Hence I conclude, that the Jews were right when they understood him to speak of his *real body and real blood.* It may be said that the error of his disciples, and of the people of Capernaum, was one which Christ was not obliged to correct. But, as St. Augustin remarks, though the Jews in a gross and carnal manner understood him to mean that he would give his flesh to them like *meat taken from a butcher's stall,* yet they understood him to speak of a *reality;* and if he did not mean to give them his flesh really, the error could have been easily corrected. But Christ was not called upon to tell them *how it would be really given*—that being a secret not to be communicated till the period of redemption was arrived. That, indeed, would be exposing the mysteries of heaven before the time. This argument appears to me to be insuperable. I will be told, in the language of Christ: "It is the spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing." I will show greater authority for my interpretation of those words than they can, who endeavour to explain away the words of our Saviour. I can produce the passages in the holy Fathers, in which they quote those identical words in order to show their meaning. We, who admit the real presence, hold, that those who receive Christ in the sacrament of the altar, if they do not receive the sacrament worthily and with the proper dispositions, do not receive with it the spirit of God—that though they receive the substance of the sacrament, the flesh doth not profit them.

Hear what St. Paul says,

"He that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh judgment to himself, not discerning the body of the Lord."

But it is behind the sacred words of eternal truth, fulfilled and verified by Christ at the last supper, that I take my stand. Upon them I erect *irrefragable* proofs.—What Christ *promised* in the sixth chapter of St. John, he *fulfilled* at his last supper. When

solemnly seated at the board with his chosen twelve, he took bread, blessed it, broke it, and gave it to them saying, "Take ye and eat, THIS IS MY BODY."—And presenting them with the chalice, he said, "Drink ye all of this, for this is my blood of the New Testament, which shall be shed for many for the remission of sins." What Christ then promised in the sixth of John, he here fulfilled to the letter, and must we not take his words in their natural and obvious sense? Shall we resort to tropes, and figures, and metaphors, in order to explain away the word of the Lord? If Mr. Pope exercises his private judgment on the passage, and pertinaciously adheres to his interpretation of the words, it is impossible we could agree upon the matter. I adhere firmly and steadily to the doctrine of the church. Look to the primitive ages of Christianity—examine the successors of the Apostles, who believed and taught what was believed and taught by the Apostles themselves, and who transmitted the doctrines to their successors. They are all in support of the doctrine of transubstantiation. I shall first quote the passage from St. Cyril of Jerusalem, in his Mystagog. Cat. 4, where taking as his text the words of St. Paul, "For I received of the Lord that which I also have delivered unto you," speaks thus of the real presence and of transubstantiation.

"This doctrine of the blessed Paul may be sufficient to satisfy you concerning the divine mysteries which you have received, that you have been made partakers of the *body* and *blood of Christ;* for he now says, that our Lord Jesus Christ in the same night in which he was betrayed, took bread, and gave it to his disciples, saying, 'Take, eat; THIS IS MY BODY.' And taking the chalice, and giving thanks, said, 'Take, drink; THIS IS MY BLOOD.' Since Christ himself, then, did so affirm, and say of the bread, 'This is my body,' who shall from *thenceforth presume to make any doubt of it?* And since he affirms and says, 'This is my blood,' who, I say, shall doubt, and say it is not his blood? He once changed water into wine (which has some likeness to blood) in Cana of Galilee, by his own power; and shall he not be thought worthy of belief in changing wine into blood? Being invited to an earthly marriage, he wrought this *stupendous miracle,* and shall we not *much rather confess,* that he gave his *own body and blood* to the children of the bridegroom? Therefore, with full assurance let us receive the body and blood of Christ. For under the type (or appearance) of bread the body is given unto thee, and under the type of wine the blood; that receiving the body and blood of Christ, thou mayest be *co-partner* with him of his *body and blood;* so shall we be *Christephori,* carriers of Christ, when we receive his body and blood into our members; and by this means (as St. Peter saith) be made partakers of the divine nature. Do not consider them as *naked bread* and *naked wine,* for it is the body and blood of Christ, according to the words of our Lord himself. For though *your senses should suggest this to you, yet let faith confirm you.*—Judge not of the thing by the taste, but rather be more certainly assured by faith, so as to leave no room for a doubt but that the body and blood are given to thee. This knowing, and of this being assured, that what appears to you bread is not bread, but the body of Christ, *although the taste judges it to be bread;* and that the wine which you see, and which has the *taste of wine, is not wine,* but the blood of Christ—'*Taste and see how sweet the Lord is!*' Think you, now, that you are required to discern this by the sense of taste?

No, by no means, but by the *testimony of faith*, which is certain, and leaves no doubt.—For when you take them, you are not commanded to take bread and wine, but under the *appearance* of these, to take the body and blood of Christ."

St. Chrysostom, in his 83d Homily on the 26th chapter of Matthew, tome 7, maintains the same doctrine.

"Let us, (says he) believe God in every thing, and not gainsay him, although what is said may *seem contrary to our reason* and *our sight. Let his word overpower both.* Thus let us do in *mysteries*, not looking only on the things that lie before us, but holding fast his words ; for his word cannot deceive, but our sense is very easily deceived. *That* never faileth—*this* often. Since, then, his word says, '*This is my body,*' let us assent and believe and view it with the eyes of our understanding. Christ left to us *nothing sensible*, but *things intellectual*, under sensible forms. Thus the blessing of baptism is given by water, which is corporeal ; but what is done by it—namely, regeneration and renovation, is incorporeal or intellectual. If *you* were *incorporeal*, he would have bequeathed to you gifts *purely incorporeal ;* but as your soul is united to a body, those gifts are to be comprehended under corporeal signs. How many persons are heard to say, I would willingly behold his figure, his shape, his attire ! But thou *seest* him—thou *touchest* him—thou *receivest* him into *thy breast ;* yet thou *desirest* to see his garments. He gives himself to thee, not to be looked upon only, but to be touched, to be eaten, to be admitted into thy breast. These are not the works of human power. He who in that supper *made these things himself*, now *also does them for you. We* hold the order of ministers, but the *sanctifier and changer of them is Himself ; who will give us of his flesh that we may be filled.*—(Job, xxxi, 31.) This Christ has done—not only allowing himself to be seen, but to be touched too, and to be eaten, and ~~teeth to~~ pierce his flesh, and all to be filled with the love of him. Parents often give their children to be nourished by others ; not so I, says Christ ; but I nourish you with my flesh, and I place myself before you. I was willing to become your brother ; for the sake of you I took flesh and blood, and again I delivered to you that flesh and blood by which I became so related."—(Hom. 24, in Joan. i, 5, p. 292.)

" What sayest thou, O blessed Paul ? Willing to impress on the hearer, and making mention of the tremenduous mysteries, thou callest them the cup of benediction."—(1st Corinth. x, 16.)

" That terrible and tremendous cup—that *which is in the cup is that which flowed from his side*, and we partake of it. It is not of the altar, but of Christ himself we partake ; let us therefore approach to him with all reverence and purity ; and when thou beholdest the *body* lying before thee say to thyself, by this body I am no longer earth and ashes. This is that very body *which bled, which was pierced by the lance.*"—(Hom. 24, in Ep. ad Cor. i, 10.)

" He that was present at the last supper, is the same who is now present, and consecrates our feast : *for it is not man who makes the things lying on the altar* BECOME THE BODY AND BLOOD OF CHRIST, *but that Christ who was crucified for us.* The *words* are pronounced by the priest, but it is the power and grace of God that consecrates them. He said, ' this is my body,' *these words make the change.*"—Hom. De Prodit. Judæ. t. v. page 415.)

" As many partake of this body, as many taste of this blood, think it *nothing different* from that which *sits above*, and is ADORED BY ANGELS."—(Hom. 3, ad Ephs. Tome 10.)

" This *table* supplies the place of the *manger ;* for even here shall lie the body of our Lord, not wrapped in swaddling clothes, as then, but surrounded on all sides by the Holy Spirit. They that are *initiated* understand these things. The magi, or wise men did *nothing but adore ;* but thou, if thou comest with a pure conscience, wilt be permitted TO TAKE HIM TO THYSELF." (Orat De S. Philogonio t. ii, p. 337.)

"The servants of Job, to show their love for him, said, 'who will give us of his flesh that we may be filled.'—(xxxi, 31.) In like manner Christ gave us *his flesh* that with it, we may be filled and inflamed with the love of him. This body lying in the manger, the wise men reverenced, seeing no such thing as thou seest; *thou* dost not see him in the manger, but on the altar—nor dost thou only see him, but moreover thou touchest him—thou eatest him, and returnest home with him in thy breast; cleanse then, thy soul from all defilement, and prepare thyself to receive these *mysteries*."—(Hom. 24 In 1, Cor. i, 10.)

"Wonderful!! The table is spread with *mysteries*, the Lamb of God is slain for thee, and the spiritual blood flows from the sacred table. The spiritual fire comes down from heaven; the blood in the chalice is drawn from the spotless side, for thy purification. Thinkest thou that thou seest bread?—that thou seest wine?—that these things pass off as other foods do?—far be it from thee to think so. But as wax, brought near to the fire, loses its former substance, which no longer remains; so do thou thus conclude that the mysteries (the bread and wine,) are consumed by the substance of the body; wherefore approaching to them, think not that you receive *divine body from a man*, but fire from the hand of a seraphim."—Hom. De Panitione sue de Euchar. in Encœniu. t. v, page 489.

"Christ was not content to be made a man—to be scourged—but reduced us, as I may say, into one mass or lump with himself, and this not only by faith, but in very deed, maketh us his own body. What ought then to be purer than he who shall *partake* of the *sacrifice*. What rays of the sun ought not those hands to *exceed in brightness* which handle this crown—that mouth which is filled with spiritual fire—that tongue which is *bloody with this admirable blood?* Call to mind with what honour thou art dignified, of what table thou partakest. For we are *fed with that thing* which, when the *angels behold, they tremble*. Neither can they *without fear* see, by reason of the glory which *cometh from thence;* and we are reduced into one mass with him, Christ's body being one and his flesh one; who shall declare the power of the Lord—who shall make known his praises? What shepherd ever fed his sheep with his own members? Many mothers, when they bring forth their children, give them to other nurses, this Christ would not do, but feeds us with his *own proper body*, and *joins*, and, as it were, *glues* us to himself."

The following passage is taken from St. Augustin, in his Enarration upon the 33d Psalm, commenting upon these words of the Septuagint:—"Ferebatur in manibus suis," he says as plain as words can make it, that though David could not carry himself in his own hands, *according to the letter*, yet the prophecy was accomplished *literally* in the *person* of Christ." The holy Father observes—

"'Ferebatur in manibus suis.'—Hoc vero fratres quomodo possit fieri in homine? Quis intelligat? Quis enim portatur in manibus suis? Manibus *aliorum* potest portari homo—manibus *suis* nemo portatur. Quomodo intelligatur in ipso Davide secundum literam *non invenimus*, in Christo autem *invenimus*. Ferebatur enim Christus in *manibus suis* quando commendans ipsum Corpus suum, ait, hoc est Corpus meum—*ferebat enim illud Corpus in manibus suis*. 'He was *borne* in his own hands.' 'How this could be done by man, brethren, who can comprehend? For what man is carried in his own hands? Man can be carried in the hands of *others*—in his *own* hands no man is carried. How this can be understood of David to the letter we do not find, but in the person of Christ we find it *literally*. For Christ was *borne in his own hands* when commending his own proper body, he said, 'this is my body,' FOR HE CARRIED THAT BODY *in his own hands*."

Some polemical smatterers have endeavoured to evade this manifest argument, by observing that Christ might carry his body in his hands, as a king or prince might carry his own picture; but the difference between these *feeble disputants* and St. Augustin is, that St. Augustin held and believed Christ to have carried *in his hands, his own true*, real, and substantial body, which he affirms, *no mere mortal could effectuate;* whereas, according to those gentlemen, Christ only did what every man could easily perform—carry about his body *figuratively*—representatively, &c.

St. Augustin Concione in Psalmum, 33, thus writes:—

"There was, you are all aware, first the sacrifice of the Jews, which consisted in victims of cattle, and that in a mystery. The sacrifice of the body and blood of our Lord which the faithful know who read the gospel, but which all do not know, and which it were to be wished some did not know to their *condemnation*, was not then instituted, which sacrifice is now established all over the world."

Again in Lib. 22, De Civit Dei. cap. iii, he relates the following fact:

"A certain man called Hesperius of the Tribunitial order, who still liveth convenient to us, hath a little farm called Zubedi in the territories of Fusali, which he having believed by the injury done his *servants and cattle* to be haunted with evil spirits, besought my priests in my absence that one of them should go thither and expel them by prayers; one accordingly went—offered there the sacrifice of Christ's body, praying with all his might that this evil would cease, and by the mercy of God it did cease."

The above passage, you will perceive, establishes not only the doctrine of Transubstantiation, but also the holy sacrifice of the Mass.—Were a priest of the present day to offer up the sacrifice of the Mass for the expulsion of evil spirits, and the preservation of cattle, what an outcry would be raised by the "Saints" against him, as if the practice were idolatrous, superstitious, and damnable.

"Christ took upon him earth from the earth, because his flesh is from the flesh of Mary, and because he here walked in this flesh, even this same flesh he gave to us to eat for our salvation: but no one eateth this flesh without having *first adored it:* and not only do we not sin by adoring it, but we sin by not adoring it. But is it the flesh that quickeneth? The Lord in exalting this earth to us, informs us that it is the spirit that quickeneth—the flesh profiteth nothing. Wherefore, in abasing yourself and in casting yourself down before any matter whatever, consider it not as matter, but consider in it that holy one of whom the body which you adored is the footstool. For it is for his sake that you adore it."—In Psal. 98.

"The man Jesus Christ, though in the form of God, he receive sacrifice with his Father, yet in the form of a servant he chose rather to be himself a sacrifice, than to receive it—thus he is the priest, himself offering, and himself the victim."—De Civit. Del. Lib. x.

Speaking of the Jews converted by St. Peter, he says,

"They were converted, they were baptized, they approached the table of the Lord, and now believing they drank that blood which in their rage they had shed."—Sermo 76. De verb. Evangel. I, v, Ed. Bened.

"We receive with a faithful heart and mouth, the Mediator of God and man—the man Christ Jesus, who has given us his body to eat, and his blood to drink; although it may appear more horrible to eat the flesh of a man than to destroy it, and to drink human blood than to spill it."

St. Hilary in his eighth book on the Trinity—

"Therefore, If Christ did truly take to himself the flesh of our body, and that this man who was born of Mary is truly Christ, and that we truly take under a mystery or veil the flesh of his body, and by this will be one with him because the Father is in him, and he in us; how is the unity of *will* asserted, since the natural propriety by the sacrament is a sacrament of perfect unity? We must not speak with human or worldly sense of the things of God. Let us read the things that are written and understand what we read, and then we shall discharge the office of perfect faith. For what we say of the natural truth of Christ in us, unless we learn it from himself, we foolishly and impiously say. For he saith, '*my flesh is truly food and my blood is truly drink*;' there is no room left to doubt of the truth of his flesh and blood: for now both by the declaration of our Lord himself and by our faith, it is truly flesh and truly blood."

St. Augustin, in his 27th tract upon St. John, commenting on the words, "the flesh profiteth nothing"—thus argues:

"What means 'the flesh profiteth nothing? It profits nothing as the Jews understood it—as it is torn in pieces in a dead body—(*quomodo in cadavere dilaniatur aut in macello venditur*,) or sold in the shambles. But it profits as quickened by the spirit; for if the flesh profited nothing the Word would not have been made flesh that he might dwell in us."

I have quoted St. Augustin's opinion to you; I could, if time permitted, refer you to eighty-seven Fathers, of whom all agree in giving the same interpretation to the passages referred to. If ever there was an era in the Christian church when transubstantiation was not received and acknowledged as the doctrine of the church, there should be some public formulary of prayer—some public and well established Liturgy, out of which that doctrine was excluded. I will prove (for I have the Liturgies here,) that this doctrine has been inculcated in all of them from the first era of Christianity down to the period of the Reformation. I have here also the Liturgy even of Nestorius. After he broached his heresy in the east, he framed a Liturgy for his followers, in which he professes his belief in the doctrine of transubstantiation. Simeon, of Thessalonica, who flourished before the council of Florence, and who was in great repute among the Greeks, says,

"When the priest or deacon has said with a loud voice τα αγια τοις αγιοις 'holy things are for the holy.' When the bishop, the priests, and the deacons have received and when the body and blood are mixed together in the chalice for the communicants, the priest or deacon carries the sacred relics of the divine bread in the sacred chalice. He shows them to all the people; that is, he shows Jesus Christ, and that which is his proper body and his true blood, which he has sacrificed for us, his purchased people, which he gives us, and permits us to taste, to see, and to feel: where the holy people see him with the soul, they *adore him* and ask of him whatever is necessary for their salvation."

And a little after he says,

"They ought to prostrate themselves on the ground, and to adore with all their souls the living bread, which, with the blood, is in the chalice."

Mr. POPE—Gentlemen, Mr. Maguire's first and direct proof of transubstantiation is taken from the priesthood of Melchisedech, who, he informs us, offered up bread and wine. The Douay version translates the 18th verse of the 14th chapter of Genesis, thus:

"But Melchisedech, king of Salem, *bringing forth* bread and wine, for he was priest of the Most High God, blessed him, and said"—

The expression, you perceive, is, "brought forth bread and wine," not "offered up bread and wine." Pererius, a Jesuit, says, that

"There is nothing here concerning oblation, but the bringing forth of bread and wine, not to God, but to Abraham, as is proved by reference to Augustin and Ambrose."

There is a strange alteration in the text of the Douay Bible. It is said, *for* he was the priest of the most High God. Pererius informs us that the Hebrew, literally rendered, should be, "and he was," and not "for he was." Melchisedech blessed Abraham; the blessing Abraham, and not the bringing forth of bread and wine, was characteristic of the priesthood of Melchisedech. Cardinal Cajetan states, "That which is introduced, touching the priesthood of Melchisedech, is a separate clause."

Christ, because he lives for ever, has an unchangeable priesthood, and therefore needs not transfer it to others. The word "priest," is a corruption of the French word "prêtre," which is derived from the Greek, "πρεσβυτερος," signifying an elder. I here challenge Mr. Maguire to produce a single passage in the New Testament, where the minister of the gospel is designated ἱερευς

My friend has brought forward, in support of the doctrine of transubstantiation, passages from the gospel of John and from the words of our Saviour, in the institution of the Lord's supper. *I put it to every rational man, whether such a doctrine as transubstantiation, which contradicts reason, and the senses given to us by God himself,—the very evidence on which the resurrection is established,—should not be built upon plain, decided, and unquestionable passages?*

I shall quote to you the opinions of a number of Roman Catholic ecclesiastics and writers, acknowledging that the scriptures do not evidently prove the doctrine of transubstantiation. Bellarmine, (De Euch. l. 3, c. 23,) Suarez, (in 3 dis. 49, qu. 75, sec. 2,) and Vasquez (in 9 part disp. 180, qu. 75, art. 2, c. 15,) admit, that Scotus acknowledges that this doctrine cannot be proved clearly from scripture. Bellarmine allows that this opinion is not

improbable; and Suarez and Vasquez confess, that Durandus made a similar statement.—(in Sent. l. 4, dist. 11, qu 1, n. 15.) Ocham, another celebrated schoolman, expressly remarks, that

"The doctrine which holds that the substance of bread and wine remains after consecration, is neither repugnant to reason nor to scripture."—(In 4, Sent. Q. 5, et Quodl. 4, Q. 3.)

Gabriel Biel, another great divine of the church of Rome, freely declares, that—

"As to any thing expressed in the canon of the scriptures, a man may believe that the substance of bread and wine doth remain after consecration."

And therefore he ascribes transubstantiation to some other revelation beside scripture, with which he *supposes* the church of Rome was favoured.—(in Canon Miss. Lect. 40.)

Cardinal De Allaco, of Cambray, plainly informs us, that—

"The doctrine of the substance of bread and wine remaining after consecration is *more easy and free from absurdity, more rational, and no ways repugnant to the authority of scripture.*"

Nay more, that for the other doctrine, viz. of transubstantiation,

"*There is no evidence in scripture.*"—(In 4, Sen. Q. 6. Art. 2.)

Cardinal Cajetan confesses that,

"The gospel no where expresses that the bread is changed into the body of Christ; that we have this from the authority of the church."

Nay he goes further,

"That there is nothing in the gospel which enforceth any man to understand these words of Christ, 'this is my body,' in a proper and not in a metaphorical sense; but the church having understood them in a proper sense, they are to be so explained."—(In Aquin. 3, part. Qu. 75, Art 1.)

I might add several quotations, to show that it is the opinion of many other Roman Catholic divines, that the doctrine of transubstantiation is not supported by holy writ. My friend has referred us to the 6th of John. He has dwelt on the superiority of the bread of which Christ speaks, to the manna which supported the Israelites in the wilderness; and contends, that if that bread be not literally the body of Christ, it possesses no superiority above the manna. I ask, what was it that came down from heaven? "I am the living bread that came down from heaven." Was it the body of Christ? Was it the sensible, corporeal frame? I put this again to you. No—the body was received from the Virgin Mary: but Christ in his divine nature came from above: Christ in his divine nature is the bread on which his people feed, spiritually, not carnally: they are nourished by the truths in which they believe. In this consists the superiority of the bread of life above the manna in the wilderness.

My friend has asked, would the Saviour have allowed the people of Capernaum to lie under a mistake? It ill becomes

as to pry into the mysterious proceedings of infinite Wisdom. "Unto you," said Christ to his disciples, "it is given to know the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven, but to them that are without in parables." I am told not only that the Jews murmured at his language, but that some of his disciples departed from him. They that were not his real followers, and had not been taught by him, is manifest by the fact that they misunderstood the spiritual meaning of the Saviour's words, and by their departure from him. If Mr. Maguire adduces this chapter in support of transubstantiation, it proves too much. In the same chapter it is said,

"He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, hath everlasting life."

If such passages prove transubstantiation, then every individual, whatever his character may be, who partakes of the outward elements, is in possession of everlasting life! Our Saviour throws light upon the import of his language when he says,

"He that *cometh* to me, shall never hunger, and he that *believeth* on me shall never thirst."—(v. 35.)

My friend will acknowledge, that *believing* is a spiritual act; and yet the Saviour distinctly says, "He that *believeth* on me shall never thirst." In strict accordance with this view is the remark of Augustin:

"Why preparest thou thy teeth and stomach? *Believe, and thou hast eaten it*"—Tract 25.

Such is the language of Augustin. Does not the Redeemer himself say,

"The *spirit* quickeneth, the *flesh* profiteth nothing; *the words* that I have spoken to you, are spirit and life."—John, vi, 46.

And when he asked those disciples who remained with him, Will ye also go away?"—they replied,

"To whom shall we go? Thou hast *the words* of eternal life, and we have believed and known, that thou art Christ the son of God."

Christ also, in reference to Judas and the disciples who departed from him, says,

"There are some of you that believe not. For Jesus knew from the beginning who they were that did not believe, and who he was that would betray him."—65, v.

Origen thus speaks:

"There is also in the New Testament a letter, which kills him who doth not *spiritually* understand those things which are said: for if we take according to the letter that which is said, except ye can eat my flesh, and drink my blood, this letter kills."—(Homil. Levit. chap. 10.)

Augustin, in his Treatise de Doctrina Christiana, says:

"If the speech be a precept forbidding some heinous wickedness or crime, or commanding us to do good, it is not figurative; but if it seem to command any heinous wickedness or crime, or to forbid that which is profitable or

beneficial to others, it is figurative. For example, 'except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink his blood, ye have no life in you.' This seems to command a heinous wickedness and crime · *therefore it is a figure;* commanding us to communicate of the passion of our Lord, and with delight and advantage to lay up in our memory (mark is not the body of Christ in our bodies, but to lay up in our *memories*) that his flesh was crucified and wounded for us.'— Lib. iii, tom. iii, p. 53, Edit. Basil, 1596.)

Mr. Maguire has referred to the Saviour's words at the institution of the Lord's Supper, "this is my body," I ask, *may* we not interpret the expression figuratively? Did the Redeemer always speak literally? Does he not say, "I am the door," (John, x, 9.) "I am the vine?" (John, xv, i.) If the Redeemer spoke even once figuratively, he may have spoken figuratively on this occasion. There is a figure in the following passage, "This is my blood of the New Testament." Here the chalice *is* the blood of Christ: the material substance of the cup is according to the letter the very blood of Christ. The Saviour speaks, we perceive figuratively in the very context. Now, if one part of the Saviour's words at the institution of the Eucharist is to be taken literally, why not the rest? But are we to suppose that the cup is transubstantiated into the blood of Christ? I would also ask Mr. Maguire, is there not another specimen of figurative language in the expression, "this is my blood which *is* shed?" Was the Saviour's blood shed when he said, "it *is* shed?" Was his body broken, when he said, "it is broken?" My friend has threatened us with a great number of quotations from the Fathers; permit me to call your attention to a few Tertullian says—

"God, in your gospel, has so revealed the matter, calling the bread his own body, that you may hence understand how he gave bread to be THE FIGURE of his own body; which body, conversely, the prophet HAS FIGURATIVELY called bread, the Lord himself being afterwards about to interpret this sacrament."—Adv. Marcion. Lib. iii, § 12, 13, p. 209

Arguing against the sceptics, who denied the certainty of sense, he says—

"*We must not call our senses in question*, lest we should doubt respecting their fidelity even in the case of Christ himself. Because, if we question the fidelity of our senses, we might peradventure be led to say, that Christ delusively beheld Satan precipitated from heaven, or delusively heard the voice of his Father, testifying of him, or was deceived when he touched Peter's mother-in-law, or smelt a different odour of the ointment which he received for his sepulture, or tasted a different flavour of the wine which he consecrated *in memory* of his blood."—De Anim. in cap, de quinque sens. oper. p. 653.

Cyril of Jerusalem says,

"With all assurance, let us partake as of the body and blood of Christ; for *under the type* of bread, His body is given to thee, and *under the type* of wine his blood is given to thee; that so thou mayst partake of the body and blood of Christ, being one body and one blood with him."—Catech. Mystag iv, p. 217.

Chrysostom says,

"Under the name of flesh scripture is wont alike to set forth the mysteries and the whole church: for it says, that they are EACH the body of Christ."—Comment in Epist. ad. Galat. c. v, oper. vol. ix, p. 1022. Commel. 1603.

Again,

"Wherefore let there approach no Judas partaking of the poison of iniquity; for the Eucharist is *spiritual* food."—De Prodit. Jud. Serm. 30, oper. vol v, p. 464.

Augustin says—

"The Lord, when he gave the SIGN of his body, did not doubt to say, this is my body."—Contr. Adiman. c. 12, oper. vol. vi, p. 69, Colon. 1616.

Again—

"In the history of the New Testament, so great and so marvelous was the patience of our Lord, that bearing with Judas, though not ignorant of his purpose, he admitted him to the banquet, in which he commended and delivered to his disciples THE FIGURE of his own body and blood."—Enarr. in Ps. iii, oper. vol. viii, p. 7.

Again,

"Christ instructed his disciples, and said unto them—'it is the spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing: the words which I speak unto you, are spirit and life:' as if he had said, understand spiritually what I have spoken: you are not about to eat this identical body which you see, and you are not about to drink this identical blood, which they who crucify me, will pour out: on the contrary, I have commended a certain sacrament unto you, which will vivify you IF SPIRITUALLY UNDERSTOOD, though it must be celebrated visibly, yet it must be understood INVISIBLY."—Enarr. in Ps. xcvii. oper. vol. viii, p. 397.

Pope Gelasius is of the same opinion.—De Duab. Nat. Christ Cont. Nestor. et Eutych. in Biblioth. Patr. vol. 4, p. 422.

I now meet my friend's challenge as to ancient liturgies. In different liturgies, even *after the words of consecration*, and after some prayers, the priest beseeches God *to make this bread the holy body of Christ, and this cup the precious blood of Christ.* These are the words used in the formulary called the liturgy of James, and the like prayer after the words of consecration occurs in the liturgies of Mark, John, Chrysostom and Basil. Is it not an article of faith in the church of Rome, that when the words of consecration are once pronounced, no bread or wine remains, but the real body and blood of Christ; and is not the Host immediately elevated and adored? If the authors of these liturgies held the same doctrine, is it not absurd, that they should offer a prayer to God, to do that which they believed had been already done; to make the bread and wine the body and blood of Christ, a thing which they believed had been already done, if they were of the same opinion with the church of Rome?

The authors of the Mass did not themselves believe in transubstantiation; they often call the Eucharist an *image*, a *pledge*. (ex Miss. Sar. et Ro.) Why should they call it an image a

pledge, if they believed it to be the thing itself? The Sarum Missal (Fer Quat. Temp.) confesses that,

"*God would have his sacraments consist of the fruits of the earth :*" they plainly acknowledge of the sacrament, "Cibavit eos ex adipe frumenti," he fed them with the flower of wheat; wherefore by their own acknowledgment, the sacrament which is eaten, is the fruit of the earth, and the flower of wheat. (Ex horis de 5, Sacr. impr. per Sac. Keruer, Paris, Ann. 1570, et in Ro. Miss. in solen. Sacratis. Corpor. Chri. in princip.)

In the Post-communion, after every bishop-confessor, the Roman Missal, and the Missal of Sarum, in the Post-communion prayer (Feria Sixta) say,

"*We beseech thee, O Lord, that giving thanks unto thee for these gifts which we have received, we may receive better gifts.*"

But if Christ be substantially present, what better gift could they desire than the Saviour himself! In another place they pray,

"*That which we have received with our mouths, O Lord, grant that with pure minds we may also take, that of a temporal gift it may be made an eternal remedy.*" (In can. Miss. et Ro. Br. Fer. 5, post po. passionis.)

Christ's *body* is not a temporal, but an everlasting gift and remedy. Again,

"*That which we have received in the image of the sacrament, grant we may receive by manifest participation.*"

After the same manner they pray again,

"*Let thy holy sacraments perfect, O Lord, that which they contain, that which we do now in show, we may receive in the certain truth of things themselves.*" (In Fest. S. Swythen. in Post-compignus vitæ æternæ in miss. Sar.

They confess that they do it in *show*. I ask, if the body and blood of Christ were actually present, would they have used this expression?

Again, in the Post-communion of the Mass of the Virgin Mary, they call the sacraments *the helps of our salvation*, salutis nostræ subsidia; but if they were the body and blood of Christ, it would be blasphemy to call him the help of salvation, who is salvation itself.—(Miss. Sar. in Post. Com. in Miss. Bea. Virg. Mar.) In the secret of the office of the dead, they say, *receive O Lord, for the soul of thy servant, the Host which thou didst offer to God the Father for us bountifully.*—(Miss. Sar. in offic. mort.) If the Host be the very body of Christ, then to offer Christ to himself would be most absurd. In the canon they pray, *that God would accept the things offered, as he accepted the sacrifice of his holy child Abel, the sacrifice of Abraham, and that which Melchisedech offered.* I ask, would it not be blasphemy to compare the sacrifices of Abel, Abraham and Milchisedech, however holy, with the body and blood of Christ?

Mr. MAGUIRE.—If my friend, Mr. Pope, would be in any manner consistent with himself, this controversy would have a speedy termination. It is no difficult matter for puny man limited as he is in understanding, to raise objections against holy mysteries. The very same objections which Mr. Pope has urged against the doctrine of transubstantiation, the Socinian may urge against the Trinity—as being a mystery incomprehensible to human reason. Hear the words spoken here on the second day of the discussion by Mr. Pope, in regard to the doctrine of the Trinity, as given in the *Morning Register:*

"I remember that reason has its legitimate province. If God has revealed the fact that three persons are one in the Divine essence, but not how that essence is formed, I believe the statement, I am not called upon to believe how it is effected. It is not for us to bring before the bar of natural reason the great Being who makes the statement. If we are convinced that this is the book of God, we must be convinced that the three divine persons are in one. It is above reason, but not opposed to reason, and we are bound to receive it."

I shall answer Mr. Pope's objections by his own arguments. Confining myself to the language of Mr. Pope, I affirm, that if it be revealed in scripture, that the sacred body and blood of Christ are bequeathed to us as a legacy, it is not for us to bring the God of heaven before the bar of natural reason. If we are convinced that the statement has been made, we must be convinced of the fact. It may be above reason, but it is not contrary to reason. In common consistency, therefore, he is bound to receive the doctrine.

Mr. Pope has recurred to Melchisedech; I did not bring forward Melchisedech as a direct proof, though perhaps it is tantamount to a direct one. The onus lies on Mr. Pope to show where or when Melchisedech did offer a sacrifice, if not in the instance to which reference has been made. Melchisedech is called a priest of the Most High. If in this instance Mr. Pope will have it that Melchisedech merely gave bread and wine to Abraham, I call upon him to show where, in any other instance, Melchisedech is recorded to have offered sacrifice to the Lord; and if he cannot, why is Melchisedech called a priest of the Most High?

I prefer to Mr. Pope's version of the scriptures that of St. Jerome, who spent fourteen years in Palestine, and the commentaries of Dr. Wall, which are in my possession. Mr. Pope quotes Catholic authorities to show that there is not *evident* proof derivable from scripture, for the doctrine of transubstantiation. There is not mathematical evidence, such as 2 and 2 make 4; for what is evident cannot be contested. But the proof approaches very nearly to an evident one, when our Saviour emphatically says, "THIS IS MY BODY," "THIS IS MY BLOOD" That surely is a very close approximation to evidence

Mr. Pope has not been able to produce any Catholic divines who contradicted the doctrine of transubstantiation. I am ready to admit, that there is no self-evident proof for the doctrine of transubstantiation; but Christ has pronounced the words "this is my body—this is my blood," and I therefore believe.

Let Mr. Pope produce any passage equally clear upon the doctrines of the Trinity—the Incarnation, or any other doctrine of Christianity. Mr. Pope says, that Christ came down, not in his body, from heaven. I assert that he did come, as to his humanity, from heaven, when Mary was overshadowed by the Holy Ghost; the Saviour's body came direct from the power and finger of God, and was formed of the substance of a pure immaculate virgin.

My Reverend opponent says, that the Redeemer was in the habit of speaking in parables. Whenever Christ made a revelation of an article of faith, did he speak in parables? Whenever such a revelation is made, I do not believe our Saviour propounds it parabolically. When some of the disciples of Jesus became shocked at his expressions at Capernaum, and when he saw the Jews alarmed and debating with themselves, and he himself becoming uneasy about this fact, as is evidenced by his subsequent question to the Apostles, "Will you also leave me?" It would be most strange that, if he had been only speaking metaphorically, he should have, as it were, confirmed them in their error, by adding this strong expression—

"Amen, I say unto you, unless you eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, you shall not have life in you."

It is a melancholy instance of human infirmity to find such objections raised against that which has been so obviously and evidently revealed. It is the doctrine of the council of Trent, that he who receives the body and blood of Christ unworthily, eats and drinks perdition to himself, not discerning the body of the Lord.

Therefore, when the doctors of the church speak of spiritual things, they mean that the sacrament may be really received by a man without its accompanying spiritual graces. No man will deny, that baptism is a representation of Christ's death and resurrection, by regenerating man from a spiritual death to a spiritual life—and yet it is acknowledged to be a real sacrament, and to confer real grace. Mr. Pope may deny the fact if he choose, but I have all the Protestants of the church of England with me on the subject. Christ's body and blood are a reality, and a figure at one and the same time—they are not given in their natural and gross manner, but as the fulfilment of the type in the old law. The Pascal Lamb was the figure of Christ's body and blood, and if the body and blood be not present, there

is no fulfilment of the type in the new law. If the sacrament be mere bread and wine, it is impossible to conceive how a man who receives unworthily can eat and drink damnation to himself. Our Saviour says "I am the door; I am the vine; I am the good shepherd." Mr. Pope concludes, that because he speaks figuratively in one instance, he does so in all. When our Redeemer said, he was the door and the vine, was there a man of common sense listening to him, who did not know that he spoke metaphorically? The expressions were not violent or unnatural, they were in accordance with the general tenor of the language of the day. But if he had taken a vine in his hand, and said, "I am this vine"—or, if he took up a door and said, "I am this door"—or, if taking hold of a shepherd he said, "I am this shepherd; then would the metaphor appear extravagant and absurd. But when he took the bread, and blessing it said, "THIS IS MY BODY"—there evidently was no metaphor intended. Had he said, "this bread is my body," such an expression would be truly metaphorical, but "this is my body," clearly supposes a change of substance.

When, at the marriage of Cana of Gallilee, our Saviour changed water into wine there was a real transubstantiation. If he had then said, "this water is wine," it would be a metaphor; but if he said, "this *is* wine," there was no metaphor, as a real transubstantiation had taken place, and there was no water there. When Moses changed his rod into a serpent, if he said, "this is a serpent," that would not be a metaphor; but had he said. "this rod is a serpent," there he would speak metaphorically When Christ therefore said, "this *is* my body," it is plain and evident that he did not speak metaphorically. If a person asked for some good wine, and that in reply another said to him, "take *this* bottle," the metaphor is natural and obvious; but if he said, handing him a bottle of milk, "this bottle *is* wine," the metaphor would then indeed be foolish, extravagant and unintelligible. Mr. Pope has quoted the words, "this is my blood which *is* shed for many for the remission of sins." This is one of the strongest proofs in support of the doctrine of transubstantiation. If the expression was, "*shall* be shed," it might seem to militate against that doctrine. But the expression "*is* shed," proves that Christ offered himself to his Father before he had actually suffered, and applied the graces annexed to the sacrament before he had actually suffered on the cross. The graces which were to flow from that offering he here applied in the sacrament, for if not, there was no sacrament instituted. Now. if he applied the graces *before his death* in the sacrament, I am at a loss to know why the action, having taken place previously to his death, should form any bar to the doctrine of transubstantiation.

St. Cyril of Jerusalem has been quoted by my friend. You shall hear him again, and you can then decide whether it be not extremely foolish to introduce that holy Father as opposed to transubstantiation. After quoting the words of St. Paul, "I have received of the Lord that which I also have delivered unto you," he proceeds to say:

"This doctrine of the blessed Paul may be sufficient to satisfy you concerning the divine mysteries which you have received, that you have been made partakers of the body and blood of Christ. The bread and wine, which before the invocation of the adorable Trinity were nothing but bread and wine, became after this invocation the body and blood of Christ. The Eucharistic bread, after the invocation of the Holy Spirit, is no longer common bread, but the body of Christ.—Wherefore, I conjure, my brethren, not to consider them any more as common bread and wine, since they are the body and blood of Jesus Christ, according to his own words; and although *your senses might suggest that to you*, let faith confirm you. Judge not of the thing by your taste, but by faith assure yourself, without the least doubt, that you are honoured with the body and blood of Jesus Christ. That which appears bread is not bread, *though the taste judge otherwise*—the wine which you see, and which *tastes like wine*, is *not wine*, but the blood of Christ."

Here St. Cyril impresses on us to believe the real presence of Christ in the sacrament, though the doctrine may appear contrary to some of our senses. Every thing which St. Cyril here says, makes for the doctrine which I now advocate; and Mr. Pope will perform a greater miracle than transubstantiation itself, if he shall demonstrate that St. Cyril was opposed to that doctrine. I wonder why all those Fathers should take such extraordinary pains to impress upon the minds of their hearers the absolute necessity of believing contrary to their seeing, touching, and tasting, if there were nothing in that sacrament but the element of bread and wine.

My friend has quoted St. Augustin likewise. From what I have quoted already, touching the sacraments, from this great father of the church, you can easily perceive that he speaks most plainly of transubstantiation. On the 33d Psalm we find, that he even calls this mystery the sacrifice of the body and blood of our Lord. I shall give you his original words.

"Erat autem, ut nostis sacrificium Judæorum in victimus peccorum secundum ordinum Aaron, et hoc in mysterio; nondum erat sacrificium Corporis et sanguinis domini quod norunt fideles et qui evangelium legerunt, quod sacrificium nunc diffusum est in toto orbé terrarum."

"There was ye are aware, first, the sacrifice of the Jews, which consisted in victims of cattle, according to the order of Aaron; and this in a mystery. The *sacrifice of the body and blood of our Lord* was not yet instituted, which the faithful know, and those who read the gospel, which sacrifice is now established throughout the whole world."

If there be nothing in the sacrament of the Eucharist but mere elements of bread and wine, it could not, nor ought it to be called a sacrifice. But St. Augustin styles it the sacrifice of the body and blood of our Lord. It is manifest then that he held a total

change of the elements into the body and blood of Christ. When therefore he speaks of the sacrament as something spiritual, he only draws a distinction between the body and blood of Christ in a carnal or gross sense, and between the body and blood of Christ in a true, substantial, but sacramental sense. The first was the error of those at Capernaum, as St. Augustin himself describes it. "Quomodo in cadevere dilaniatur, aut a macello venditur." The second is the true and orthodox sense, as the same Father explains it. "Quomodo spiritu vegetatur." This, I think, most satisfactorily reconciles St. Augustin's apparent discrepancy. I here request that you will reflect upon the passage of St. Augustin, where he describes one of his priests offering up the sacrifice of the mass for the servants and cattle of Tribune.

I could quote several other passages from St. Augustin, if his authority were called in question, on that subject. I have sixty or seventy Fathers, (Ignatus, Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Tertullian, Origen, Hyppolitus, and Cyprian, &c, &c, &c,) whom I could also quote if time permitted. The extracts are here on the table. I take not their words *mutatis mutandis*, but I am ready to read whole passages from them, where they treat on this subject professedly. St. Augustin, you will remember, in his Commentary on the words of the 33d Psalm, "ferebatur in manibus suis," says that our Lord carried his body in his own hand, at his last supper. After such passages, it is idle and foolish in the extreme to quote St. Augustin as opposed to the doctrine of transubstantiation.

I shall now proceed to notice the other objections advanced by Mr. Pope. The book of Gelasius is doubted by many critics, and it is uncertain whether it was written by Pope Gelasius, or by Gelasius Cyzinicus. But even supposing it to have been written by Pope Gelasius, I am here ready to show that it proves nothing against the doctrine of transubstantiation, as Hawarden has plainly demonstrated. Mr. Pope has quoted the ancient Liturgies to show that prayers were offered to God to change the elements *after* the words of consecration had been pronounced. Dr. Brett, a Protestant, and who was by no means favourably inclined to Popery, translated all the ancient Liturgies from the original Greek. I am ready to prove from every one of them, that the sacrifice of the Mass and transubstantiation were derived from the Apostles, and believed throughout the church, both eastern and western. In the Liturgy of St. James, which has been quoted by Mr. Pope, after the words:

"This is my body which is broken and given for you, for the remission of sins." "This is my blood of the New Testament, which is shed and given for you and for *many*, for the remission of sins."

And, after some prayers, he thus addresses himself to Almighty God,

"Send down, O Lord, this thy most holy spirit upon us, and upon these holy gifts here set before thee: that by his holy, good, and glorious presence he may sanctify and make this bread the body of thy Christ, and this cup the precious blood of thy Christ."

It was here objected that the Greeks did not believe in transubstantiation, because after the words of consecration they prayed: "Make this bread the holy body of thy Christ, and this cup the precious blood of thy Christ." But this objection was fully answered by the Greeks themselves in the council of Florence, who by the mouth of Isidorus, metropolitan of Syria, and legate of the patriarch of Antioch, and one of the seven deputed by the Greek prelates to dispute with the Latins, replied that the Greeks did unanimously believe the consecration to be valid, and the change to be effected by the words of Christ:—"This is my body—this is my blood;" and that they differed from the Latin church, merely as to the manner of explaining themselves. But that having found the above prayer in the missals of Saints Basil and Chrysostom, which they then used, and which were extant without any alteration, long before the time of their separation from the Latin church, they did not think fit to discard it. I shall give you the words of Isidorus himself as they were taken down by the interpreter of the said council:—

"Hoc Missale quo utimur est traditum a Basilio et beato Chrysostomo: utebamur autem eo aute tempus schismatis, nec aliqua facta est mutatio: tamen occidentalis Ecclesia nunquam de hoc verbum fecit, videlicet cum fuerimus concordes, et ad eundem finem tendentes; secundum rem dicimus idem, et credimus id quod conficit mysterium esse sermonem Domini, et Dominicam vocem esse effectricem divinorum munerum, et illa vox semper explicatur a sacerdote, et suscipit sacerdes quod vox replicata aptetur, et sit eadem vox cum voce Domini; et ut ita aptetur, invocatur spiritus sanctus et supplicat sacerdos, ut per virtutem spiritus sancti concedatur gratia ut vox repetita efficiatur ita effectiva, ut verbum Dei fuit; et ita credimus consummativa fieri per illam orationem sacerdotis. Dominicæ voces habent operationem ut semina, quia sine semine non potest effici fructus; ita in hoc dominica voce: tamen ubi cadet semen, eget aliis instrumentis ut sacerdotis, altaris, orationum, unde credimus per hoc vobiscum esse concordes."

"This Missal which we use was delivered to us by St. Basil and St. Chrysostom, and it is the same we used before the time of the schism: nor is there any change made in it; yet the Latin church never made any exception on this head, inasmuch, as we were of one accord, and tending to the same end. We in reality say the same thing, and believe that that which completes the mystery is the word of the Lord, and that the word of our Lord produces the divine gifts, and that the word is always expressed by the priest, and the priest takes care that the word repeated should be adapted to, and be the same with the word of our Lord; and that it may be so adapted, the Holy Ghost is invoked, and the priest prays that by virtue of the Holy Ghost grace may be granted, that the repeated word may be made as effective as the word of God was. And so we believe that it becomes consummated by that prayer of the priest. The words of our Lord are operative like seed

for as fruit cannot be produced without seed, so it is in this word of our Lord yet where this seed falls it requires other instruments, for example a priest an altar, and prayers, whence we believe that in this matter we substantially accord with you."

Mr. Pope.—Mr. Maguire, in maintaining the doctrine of transubstantiation, observed, that it is such a mystery, that we are not to pry into it, and endeavoured to institute a comparison between it and the doctrine of the Trinity. I deny altogether that any parallelism exists. On the doctrine of the Trinity we are incapable of exercising our senses. Man, by the mere exercise of sense, cannot find out the Almighty. An infinite distance exists between the Divine nature and my faculties. But my senses, in their legitimate province, are a divine revelation, and the direct inlets of knowledge to the mind. Though they cannot investigate the nature of God, for it is above their reach, I can bring one and all of them to bear upon transubstantiation; and their united testimony is, that the bread is bread, and the wine is wine. Hence no parallel can be drawn between transubstantiation and the doctrine of the Trinity.

My friend has said, that the onus rests on me to show, that Melchisedech made an offering, in order to demonstrate the priesthood. I answer, that it is quite sufficient for me, that God has called him a priest. I have already referred to Roman Catholic authority to show, that the word translated "*brought* FORTH," is properly rendered, the original expression having no reference to oblation; that the word rendered "*for*," in the Douay Bible, does not signify "*for*," but "*and*," and that the latter part of the eighteenth verse is a separate clause.

Mr. Maguire has told us, that two and two make four. Does he mean to introduce this arithmetical calculation to illustrate the proposition, that *that which has all the properties of bread is flesh?* Such a position I maintain, is absurd, opposed to the common sense of mankind, to the testimony of our senses, and contradictory to the doctrines of holy writ.

My friend has said, that the body of Christ came down from above in consequence of his preternatural generation, through the power of the Holy Ghost. I would refer him to the language of the Athanasian creed, which Mr. Maguire has subscribed. That formulary, speaking of the Saviour says, "God of the substance of the Father, begotten before the world, and *man of the substance of his mother*, born in the world." So much for Mr. Maguire's theological accuracy.

My friend has said, that the council of Trent holds, that although man may partake of the body and blood, soul and divinity of Christ, yet, if he possesses not the grace of God, he shall perish. I would ask a simple question. Why should the

council of Trent take one part of our Saviour's words literally and in other passages, where the scripture militates against the views of the church of Rome, reject the literal sense?

Mr. Maguire has said, if the Saviour took the door in his hands and said, "I am this door;" or if he took the vine in his hand, and said, "I am this vine," the case would have been different—but methinks transubstantiation is still more absurd; for he supposes Christ to intimate, "Here am I, sitting with you at the table, circumscribed as to my humanity, and this bit of bread which I hold in my hand is my body; I grasp this body within the palm of my hand, and I give this body from myself to you. I give myself from myself, to be partaken of before my eyes." My friend has referred us to the marriage-feast. I am glad that he has reminded us of a *sensible* transubstantiation. I imagine that the guests *saw* that the water was changed into wine, and from their *taste* also, were conscious of the change. My friend perceives, that they had only to exercise their senses to discover, that that which had been water, with all the properties of water, was now wine, with all the properties of wine.

If Mr. Maguire allowed his flock to exercise their senses they too would find, that after consecration the bread is still bread, and the wine still wine. Mr. Maguire has made an extraordinary statement, that Christ offered himself up, before he offered himself up! He should be loath to throw out insinuations against the correctness of my quotations—I have already exposed him. Was he not detected yesterday in a quotation from a work, to the original of which I referred you? He says, that he quotes from originals—I will not charge my friend with an intention wilfully to mislead us,—he was, I will admit, himself deceived, having implicitly confided in the quotations placed in his hands; but I say, Mr. Maguire should be cautious. I have several other quotations. St. Augustin says upon the words:

"'Me ye have not always.' He speaks of the presence of his body; ye shall have me according to my providence, according to majesty and invisible grace; but according to the flesh which the Word assumed, according to that which was born of the Virgin Mary, ye shall not have me; therefore, because that he conversed with his disciples forty days, he is ascended up into heaven and is not here."—Tract 50 in Joan. Edit. Basil. 1596.

Yet the church of Rome says, that the body of Christ is on every altar! In the 23d epistle—

"If the sacraments (says he) had not some resemblance of these things whereof they are sacraments, they would not be sacraments at all; but from this resemblance they take for the most part the names of the things which they represent; therefore, as the sacrament of the body of Christ is in some manner or sense Christ's body, and the sacrament of his blood, is the blood of Christ, so the sacrament of faith (meaning baptism) is faith."—23d Epist. Tom. ii, p. 93.

In this passage St. Augustin shows the meaning of the words employed to designate the Eucharist, and explains many of the strong expressions to be found in Mr. Maguire's quotations.

St. Clement of Alexandria, who lived in the second century says,

"Inasmuch as Christ declared, that the bread which I give you is my flesh, and inasmuch as flesh is irrigated by blood, therefore the wine is ALLEGORICALLY CALLED blood.—Pædag. Lib. i, c. 6, p. 104. For the word is ALLEGORICALLY DESIGNATED by many different names, such as meat and flesh, and nourishment, and bread, and blood, and milk; for the Lord is all things for the enjoyment of us who have believed in him. Nor let any one think we speak strangely, when we say that milk is ALLEGORICALLY CALLED the blood of the Lord, for is not wine likewise ALLEGORICALLY CALLED by the very same appellation?"—Pædag. lib. i, c. 6, p. 105.

Again,

"The scripture, then, has named wine A MYSTIC SYMBOL of the holy blood."—Ibid. lib. ii, c. 2, p. 156.

Again,

"Be well assured, that Christ also himself partook of wine, inasmuch as he also was a man. He moreover blessed the wine, saying, take, drink this is my blood, the blood of the vine. The consecrated liquor of exhilaration, therefore, ALLEGORICALLY REPRESENTS the Word, who poured himself out on behalf of many for the remission of sins."—Ibid. lib. ii, c. 2, p. 158.

I have various other quotations to the same effect, but my time is too precious to be expended in reading them; you can judge whether they are not stronger than those which my friend has cited. I am convinced that the quotations which I have read, are correctly given. My opponent has doubted that passage of Pope Gelasius:

"Certainly the sacraments of the body and blood of the Lord which are received, are a divine thing, because by these we are made partakers of the divine nature; nevertheless *the substance or nature of the bread and wine ceases not to exist*, and assuredly *the image and similitude* of the body and blood of Christ are celebrated in the action of the mysteries."—*De duab. Christi Natur. Cont. Nest. et Eutych. in Biblioth. Patr.* vol. iv, p. 422.

My friend tells me that this book is doubted; but there is stronger reason why my passages should be genuine than his. Protestants have no *index expurgatorius* to which the Fathers must be subject—"Solius est Dei adorari" is purged by that index from the index of the works of Athanasius and Augustin—and if a doctrine of that nature could be purged, is there any reason to doubt that the passages which *remain untouched*, are the genuine sentiments of their originals.—Adorari solius Dei est: (adoration belongs to God alone) deleatur ex. ind. oper. Athanasii Indice lib. Prohib. et Expurg. p. 52. Madrit. An. 1627. Item ex In. Oper. St. August. ibid. p. 56.

Mr. Maguire has produced passages from Luther. I ask him in the face of the world to produce the places from which they

are taken. They carry upon the face of them their own refutation. I am satisfied that many of them were never uttered by that eminent and intrepid reformer, the great and mighty Luther. As to the liturgies *to which I referred*, in order *to meet my opponent on his own ground*, they have little weight with me; but they show the opinions of the individuals who used them, upon the subject. The Greeks gave, I imagine, but a lame and confused account of them at the council of Florence, and these liturgies were composed one thousand years before that council. If transubstantiation, which, the church of Rome says, takes place as soon as the words of consecration are uttered, was held by those who used these liturgies, it would be inconsistent, that the prayer should be subsequent to the words of consecration, and that even after consecration they should continue to call the elements *gifts*. I admit, that the expression is strong, (but remember, that it was used after consecration) namely, that God would make this bread, the holy body of Christ. We have learned from Augustin, that the names of the things signified are often employed instead of the names of the signs. My friend has not met me respecting the authors of the mass not believing in transubstantiation. I am convinced that he cannot controvert my proofs, that they did not believe in that doctrine. To proceed with my arguments—I have shown that the Saviour, even in the very place which describes the institution of the sacrament, as well as elsewhere, employed figurative language. What reason have we for thinking that there is not figurative language in this passage also? I shall assign to you my reasons for believing that the expression, "this my body," is to be taken in a figurative sense also. Our Saviour says, "do this for a commemoration of me."—(Luke, xxii, 19.) I ask, if the real body and blood of Christ—if Christ himself, be substantially present, how the Eucharist can be observed as a commemorative act? The commemoration of a person betokens that the person commemorated is *absent*, not present. "As often as ye eat this bread, and drink the chalice, ye shall show the death of the Lord till he come."—(1 Cor. xi, 25.) There are innumerable figurative expressions in holy writ. "The seven full ears *are* seven years of plenty, the seven lean kine *are* seven years of famine."—(Gen. xli, 26, 27.) "The seven candlesticks *are* the seven churches."—(Apoc. i, 20.) "The seven heads *are* seven mountains."—(Apoc. xvii, 9.) In the passover itself, we have the expression, "it *is* the Lord's passover," (Exod. xii, 11.) or as the Douay version renders it, "it is the phase of the Lord." The auxiliary verb, in the sense of "represent," is usual to the sacred writers. Recollect too, that the words, "this is my body," were addressed to Jews, who were accustomed to this

style of language at the feast of the passover. Justin Martyr tells us, that the form of words, used at the passover from Ezra's time, was, "this passover is our Saviour and our refuge,"—(Dial. cum Tryph. p. 297. Ed. Paris, 1639.)—that is, this passover represents him, who is our Saviour and our refuge Bear in mind, therefore, *that our Saviour addressed himself to men who were prepared to understand him in a figurative sense.* Further—the Jews were forbidden to eat blood; (Lev. xvii, 10 11, 12.) would not the feelings of the Apostles have been shocked, if they believed that the Saviour had commanded them to partake of it. The prohibition was not subsequently repealed; for, as my friend has observed, the council of Jerusalem, as he terms it, enforced an abstinence from blood. Again, if the Saviour's words are to be taken literally, they would do away with the nature of a sacrament, and contradict the prophecy which says, "Thou wilt not suffer thy Holy One to see corruption."—Psalm xv, 10.

Sacred Writ says, that the body of Christ shall not see corruption: but the elements, even after consecration, are corruptible; therefore, we argue, that they cannot have been transubstantiated into that body, which does not see corruption. Mark the consequence of rejecting the testimony of sense: that which proves the truth of Christ's resurrection, proves the falsehood of transubstantiation; but if the testimony of sense is to be refused, then we weaken the evidence for the Christian revelation. St. John, in his first epistle, first chap. says,

"That which we have *heard*, which we have *seen* with our eyes, which we have looked upon, and which our hands have *handled*, of the word of Life: for the life was manifested: and we have seen and do bear witness, and declare unto you the life eternal, which was with the Father, and hath appeared to us: that which we have seen and have heard, we declare unto you, that you also may have fellowship with us, and our fellowship may be with the Father and with his Son Jesus Christ."

When Thomas doubted, the Saviour said to him,

"Put in thy finger hither, and *see* my hands, and bring hither thy hand, and put it into my side; and be not faithless but believing."—John, xx, 27.

The Saviour, 'tis true, added, "Blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed." But he did not say, "Blessed are those who have *seen*, and yet have not believed;" the blessing was not to those, who having the opportunity of seeing, disregarded the testimony of their senses, but to those who not seeing, yet believed—who, when the evidence of sense was wanting, yet believed. I would ask, what is the use of this irrational and extraordinary doctrine? I will tell you—to make demi-gods of the Roman Catholic priests—to raise them in the estimation of the people, and to cause the multitude to look up to them as men

who can create their God. In the dark ages, an account of which I read to you, when the priests domineered over the intellects of men, when abuses and fictions were introduced, was this monstrous doctrine established. You have heard the story of the mule—the heretic was convinced—he exercised his senses on the miracle. Now, if he exercised his senses on the miracle why should he not have exercised them on transubstantiation itself? Permit me also to add, that the Saviour most probably spoke in the Syriac language—and, as in that tongue there is no word signifying "to represent," was under the necessity of employing the auxiliary verb. I now call upon Mr. Maguire to meet me upon the question like a man, and not to beat about the bush—to use a vulgar phrase.

Mr. MAGUIRE.—I hope, gentlemen, you wish to hear more than one side of the question; if you are sincerely anxious to know the truth, you will hear both with equal attention. My friend has called upon me to follow him step by step, I thought my *forte* throughout this discussion was the use of argument, and from the first day up to this moment, I could never keep my friend from preaching sermons, and confine him to the question at issue. He denies that any parallelism exists in the cases of the mysteries of the Incarnation, the Trinity, and Transubstantiation. But he there calculates without his host—has he attempted to show that these doctrines are not mysteries? Has he quoted texts of scripture against me, as I have against him? Has he brought forward a single direct text from scripture against me? One thing is clear, by rejecting transubstantiation, *because it is a mystery*, this gentleman overturns all mysteries, and is become a professed Socinian. He has quoted the evidence of the senses against transubstantiation. But even if that doctrine contradicted the senses, he should recollect that the senses have nothing to do with regard to a mystery. St. Paul says, "Faith then cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of Christ." I call on Mr. Pope to prove that transubstantiation is not a mystery—I call upon him to show, that we are not to believe the doctrine because it appears opposed to the evidence of some of the senses, though we are told that "faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of Christ." We find that St. Paul here excludes all the senses as judges of mysteries, save the sense of hearing *only*. If the senses be not constituted as the proper judges of mysteries to pronounce upon their truth, then all his reasoning as to the evidence of the senses falls to the ground. St. Cyril of Jerusalem brings forward arguments to shew, that the evidence of the senses may be contradicted in a mystery, and I have quoted St. Augustin. where that holy

Father says, that "Christ held his body in his own hands." It was absurd, then, on the part of my opponent, to press St. Augustin into an opposition to this doctrine. He has enlarged upon the senses as the bulwark of our faith. The senses often contradict themselves—or rather contradict facts; thus, Joshua seeing an angel, mistook him for a man. The woman at the sepulchre saw two young men at the tomb, and yet the scripture tells us they were angels, and God appeared in the form of man, and yet was taken for a mere man. Here, then, the senses contradicted themselves. Again, if you immerse a straight stick in water, you would almost swear, were you to believe your sight, that the stick was crooked. In natural things it is very common to see the senses contradicted. In the strict sense of the word, it is true they are not contradicted, for it is not the business of the senses to pronounce judgment according to the principles of philosophy; they are to convey the impressions made upon them to the mind—to relate merely what appears to them. In respect to the angel and the stick, they merely relate to the mind what appears as a fact to them When a man sees what is called a wafer, he tastes and smells it; and here I grant these senses contradict his faith. But to the senses we oppose the *express promises* of Christ, and believe with St. Paul that faith cometh by hearing; and that our Lord bequeathed to man, as a test of his love, a most extraordinary but mysterious legacy. As Mr. Pope argues that the testimony of the senses is fatal to transubstantiation, it remains for him to show, either that it is not a mystery, or that faith cometh not by hearing, for no sense is allowed to judge of mysteries, but the sense of hearing. Christ said, "*this is* my body." The Apostles heard the words pronounced, and their sense of hearing was the only judge. We have it upon their testimony, that Christ spake the words, consequently our faith must come from hearing. How will my friend prove the doctrine of the Trinity? It contradicts *all* the senses, save that of hearing, so does the doctrine of the Incarnation. If that be the case, if angels be taken for men, and that the senses are thus led astray, it is absurd to say that a mystery is not to be believed, because it contradicts the senses. Mr. Pope has recurred to Melchisedech. I challenged him to show that Melchisedech ever offered up sacrifice but on one occasion, and yet he is called a priest of the Most High. And Christ is called by the royal prophet and by the Apostle Paul, "a priest for ever according to the order of Melchisedech." Melchisedech could not be a priest without offering up a sacrifice. This he did when he offered the bread and wine; why were they introduced? Evidently to show that he made an offering. Jerome's testimony on this matter is preferable to that of Mr. Pope. I

care not for the Hebrew originals, as they are called. It is admitted by two Protestant divines, Doctors Wall and Mills, that the old Italian version is the purest copy extant of the Bible I have all the Lutheran churches against Mr. Pope on this matter, and all the heretics till the days of Berengarius. He first denied the doctrine of transubstantiation; but he died a convert, and was heartily sorry for his fatal error. After him, it is an admitted fact, that Zuinglius, in his comment on the words, "Hoc est corpus meum," substituted the verb "*representat*" for the verb "*est*," so that the sense would run, "This *represents* my body." And this doctrine he confesses to have received from a spectre; but he adds, "Nescio an albo, an nigro," "I know not whether it was *black* or white." Luther, in the most ferocious manner, attacked Calvin on the subject. He maintained the doctrine of the real presence against Calvin and Zuinglius; he defied them, as I have defied my friend, to disprove that doctrine by arguments drawn from scripture; he describes them as differing from all the churches in the world, and from the Lutheran churches in particular.

My friend has introduced the marriage at Cana in Gallilee, to show that there the transubstantiation was made palpable to the senses. I am sorry to perceive, that he is unable to distinguish between the nature of a mystery and a miracle. Because Christ performed a miracle, of which the senses were able to judge, of course it follows, that the senses are able to pronounce upon a mystery. Oh! profound argument—oh! noble logician. Do the doctrines of the Trinity and of the Incarnation fall under the judgment of the senses? If Christ performed miracles to convert the Jews and Pagans, it must therefore follow, according to Mr. Pope, that all mysteries are false. If the Incarnation and the Trinity are to be brought under the cognizance of the senses, then the doctrine of original sin must be rejected, for it never can be understood by man, nor can the senses reconcile it with the divine goodness and mercy. I introduced the marriage at Cana, to show that it is not incompatible with *Christ's power* to work the miracle of transubstantiation, because, in one of his first miracles, he changed water into wine, which was purely a transubstantiation. But I never introduced that miracle directly to prove that he instituted the mystery of transubstantiation at his last supper.

It is a principle in logics that comparisons are not to hold throughout all their bearings. As to the passage from Gelasius, it remains for Mr. Pope to prove it genuine. Hawarden has already answered, that it is doubted amongst critics whether this work was written by Pope Gelasius, or by Gelasius Cyzinicus, the author of a book "De duabus Christi Naturis." The writer

of this book, whoever he was, observes, that because appearances or accidents continue after consecration, we must carefully distinguish between the appearances and the reality, viz.—the body and blood of Christ. His words are—

"Et tamen esse non desinit substanta vel natura panis et vini."

"And yet the substance or nature of bread and wine does not cease."

Those words are quite reconcileable with orthodox doctrine, for the substance or nature of bread and wine remains after consecration, as far as the senses are concerned. And that this was the meaning of Pope Gelasius, (supposing him to have been the author) is pretty clear, from his using the disjunctive preposition "vel," "or," which certainly qualifies the apparent harshness of the sentence. The words *substance* and *nature* are not always used to express the essential properties of a subject—substance is one thing—and the nature of a substance another. Thus a stone is a substance, and so is iron but the hardness of the stone and the hardness of iron is the nature of the substance. Let any man examine the work itself, and he will find that there is nothing in those words inconsistent with the doctrine of transubstantiation.

My opponent has accused me of misquoting. It shall appear to the world which of us has been convicted of misquotations. As soon as this discussion has terminated, and the report of it is published, I shall certainly go to Manchester library, and consult the editions of the Fathers preserved there. Although my friend has Trinity College at his back, with all its fellows to assist him, it shall then be made manifest, who was the more correct in quoting from the Fathers. This gentleman would make transubstantiation appear a foolish doctrine, because Christ should be present in so many places at once. My opponent is truly a wonderful philosopher. May I ask him, can he describe the properties of a spiritualized and purified body? The body of our Saviour, after his resurrection passed through the pores of a door. Is not that inexplicable? I should be happy to hear Mr. Pope describe the properties of a body spiritualized and of a spirit. The Devil himself can be present in many places at once—otherwise he could not tempt mankind. According to my principles, and those of every Catholic, it is blasphemy to call in doubt the omnipresence of Christ. And will those who pretend to venerate the Saviour so much, presume to call it in question? If Christ's humanity be hypostatically united to his divinity, does not he who circumscribes the one, by implication circumscribe the other? My friend doubts the passages which I have quoted from Luther. I have here 600 passages more from him, which respect for the present assembly prevents me from

quoting now—I have the book here—I can prove the authenticity and genuineness of the text—I will publish my quotations in the report of the present proceedings—then let the fellows of Trinity College convict me, if they can, of false quotations. My friend has quoted the words "Do this in remembrance of me." The following is the language of the Latin Vulgate :

"Hoc facite in meam commemorationem." "Do this in remembrance of me."

St. Paul in the 11th chapter of his first epistle to the Corinthians, explains the above thus :

"Quotties cunque enim, manducabitis panem hunc et calicem bibetis mortem domini anunciabitis, donec veniat."—"For as often as you shall eat this bread, and drink this chalice, you shall show forth the death of the Lord until he come."

St. Paul clearly explains what our Lord meant by the words, "Do this in remembrance of me,"—that is, as often as you do this, you will commemorate my death and passion. The reality, therefore, of Christ's presence in the sacrament of the altar, by no means excludes the idea of a commemoration, for although the present sacrifice be truly a sacrifice, yet as it is not a bloody sacrifice, it may be justly entitled a commemoration of the bloody one on the cross. The unbloody sacrifice of the mass is the remembrance of the death and passion of Christ, and as often as it is celebrated the death and passion of our Lord are shown forth until he come. Christ, therefore, was justified in calling it in that sense a remembrance, though in the other sense he is really present, and is really offered up. But my friend has endeavoured to confuse with figurative expressions the immutable words of scripture. He would leave nothing clear or certain in the Bible. Every thing according to him is to be taken in a metaphorical sense. Should I attempt to do so, he would insist on holding me to the precise terms of the text, and when I endeavour to confine him to the strict meaning, he has recourse to tropes and metaphors. It is impossible in such a way, to prove the falsehood of a doctrine which has been held in the church for 1800 years. The Arians, the Manicheans, the Eutychians, and all such noted heretics, never denied the real presence of Christ in the sacrament of the altar.

My friend has quoted the liturgies. I have them here as translated by Dr. Brett, a Protestant, and no friend to the Catholics, and they all prove transubstantiation. Mr. Pope has called the Lord's passover the type of Christ. It is admitted on all hands, that it was the type of Christ's body. Ought not the thing typified exceed in substance and reality the type? There was real blood in the passover. The blood of the lamb was spilled at the doors, and it was a type of the blood of Christ

If the type was the real blood of the animal, of course that is more important which is the antitype—namely, the real blood of Christ—the type is itself the confirmation of the thing typified.

The Jews were told, "eat not blood." I ask any man possessed of common sense, if the eating of that which is *apparently* bread and wine, is to be considered in the same light as the eating of animal blood? The Apostle has been quoted, and I never heard a more wilful misinterpretation of scripture. The command of the Apostles applied to that only which had all the natural appearances of blood. They gave an express commandment not to eat it, and I therefore called on Mr. Pope to show by what authority he was permitted to take *gravy*. I called upon him to prove from the Bible by what authority the sign of the cross is made in baptism—to prove from the Bible the procession of the Holy Ghost—to show why he neglected to wash his neighbor's feet, in contradiction to our Saviour's command, and why he did not observe the Jewish sabbath. From a notice of all those questions he has *prudently* abstained. You, gentlemen, will estimate the value of such *prudence*.

But Mr. Pope says, that the body of Christ will never see corruption. He should prove, that when the species begin to decay, Christ could not extricate himself and ascended to his heavenly Father. Are the rays of the sun polluted by passing through an unclean medium? If that be so in the natural world it is foolish to think that Christ could be contaminated by contact with corruptible matter. Mr. Pope has quite established the Socinian system by his arguments. The Socinian admits no principle but reason as his guide—neither does Mr. Pope. The Socinian will only interpret the sacred scriptures according to his private judgment. Mr Pope coincides with him fully on that point. The Socinian rejects transubstantiation, and all mysteries, as contrary to reason. Will Mr. Pope go that length? His arguments certainly tend thereto. Now, I can prove that the doctrine of the real presence was not alone retained by Luther, but that the doctrine was retained in the church of England until she became Calvinistical. Mr. Pope's arguments would go to show that no preparation was necessary for the receiving of the sacrament in the church of England—that no moral change was required, and that only a bit of bread and wine, instead of the body of Christ, were received in the communion. Bishop Andrews, in the time of James the first, in his answer to Bellarmine, admits that Chrst is present in the sacrament of the altar; and he adds:

"I also with St. Ambrose adore the flesh of Christ in the mysteries."

Bishop Forbes, De Eucharistia, Lib. ii, Cap. 2, has the following remarkable passage:

"The sounder Protestants make no doubt of adoring Christ in the Eucharist."

And,

"It is a monstrous error," says he, "of the rigid Protestants (Calvinists) who deny that Christ is to be adored in the Eucharist, except only with an inward adoration of the mind, but not with any outward act of adoration, as kneeling, or other like posture of the body. These people commonly have not a right belief of Christ in the sacrament, in which he is present after a wonderful but real manner."

Thorndyke says, in lib. iii, cap. 30, page 360—

"I suppose the body and blood of Christ may be adored wheresoever they are; and must be adored by a good Christian, where the custom of the church which a Christian is obliged to communicate with, requires it. And is not the presence thereof in the sacrament of the Eucharist, a just occasion presently to express, by that bodily act of adoration, that inward honour, which we always carry towards our Lord Christ as God?"

And,

"Not to baulk that freedom, (says he) which hath carried me to publish all this, I do believe, that it was so practised and done in the ancient church, and in the symbols before receiving."

Dr. Cosin, in stating the doctrines of the church of England, says:

"That God's omnipotency can change one substance into another, none will deny; and we see it done by Christ in the town of Gallilee, when he changed the water into wine, and it was a true and proper transubstantiation. We do not say that God is not able to make the body of Christ present, and truly give it in the sacrament, whilst the substance of the bread remains. We believe a presence and union of Christ with our soul and body, which we know not how to call better than sacramental; that is effected by eating; that while we eat and drink the consecrated bread and wine, we eat and drink therewithal the body and blood of Christ, not in a corporeal manner, but some other way, incomprehensible, known only to God, which we call spiritual. We confess with the Fathers that this manner of presence is unaccountable and past finding out; not to be searched and pried into by reason, but believed by faith. For it is more acceptable to God, with an humble simplicity of faith to reverence and embrace the words of Christ (this is my body,) than to wrest them violently to a strange and improper sense, or to determine what exceeds the capacity of men and angels. We do not find fault with a general explication of the manner. We confess the necessity of a supernatural and heavenly change, and that the signs cannot become sacraments but by the infinite power of God. The bread, as I have often said, does not only represent the body of our Lord, but also, being received, we are truly made partakers of that precious body; for so saith St. Jerome, 'the body and blood of Christ is made at the prayer of the priest; that is, the elements so qualified, that being received, it becomes the communion of the body and blood of Christ, which it could not without the preceding prayers. And if it seem impossible that the flesh of Christ should descend, and come to be our food through so great a distance, we must remember how much the power of the Holy Spirit exceeds our sense and our apprehensions, and how absurd it would be to undertake to measure his immensity by our weakness and narrow capacity, and so make our faith to conceive and believe what our reason cannot comprehend. Yet our faith doth not cause, or make that presence, but apprehends it as most truly and really effected by the word of Christ. The faith whereby we are said to eat the flesh of Christ, is not that only whereby we believe that he died for our sins, for this faith is required and supposed to

passed the sacramental manducation; but more properly that whereby we believe those words of Christ, 'this is my body.' For in this mystical eating by the wonderful power of the Holy Ghost, we do invisibly receive the *substance of Christ's body and blood*, as much as if we should *eat* and *drink* them *both visibly*. It remains that we should with faith and humility admire this high and sacred mystery, which our tongue cannot sufficiently explain, nor our heart conceive. The presence of Christ in this mystery is not opposed to distance but to absence, which only could deprive us of the benefit and fruition of the object. As the body and blood of Christ are conveyed by this sacrament to the worthy receiver, so they are offered by it to all, that is truly really, and substantially."—(*See Dr. Cosin's History of Transubstantiation* Anno. 1676, pages 117, 55, 2, 44, 34, *et alibi passim.*)

What says the Book of Common Prayer, sanctioned by Queen Elizabeth, on this subject—

"Grant us so to eat the flesh of thy dear Son Jesus Christ, and to drink his blood, that our sinful bodies may be made clean by his body."

And, in giving the sacrament :—

"The body of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was given for thee, preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life. The blood of our Lord Jesus Christ which was shed for thee, preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life."

Mr. POPE.—Mr. Maguire, in several of his arguments, has taken it for granted, that I allowed the doctrine of transubstantiation to be revealed in the sacred volume. I need scarcely remark, that I have made no such concession. Inasmuch as the mystery of the Trinity does not come under the cognizance of our senses, they being incapable of exercising their powers upon the nature of the Deity, no parallel can be instituted between it and transubstantiation. Strange to say, my friend has observed, that I have become a Socinian. My letter is before the public containing proofs of the essential Godhead of Christ. I fling from me, therefore, such a charge—shall I say, with indignation.

Mr. Maguire has observed, that if transubstantiation be a mystery, its being opposed to the evidence of our senses should not stand in the way of its reception. The observation which I made in the commencement of this speech, will meet this position. Transubstantiation, if revealed, would indeed be a mystery ; but I beg to assert, that it is not revealed ; it is opposed to sense and reason, and is repugnant to the entire tenour of scripture.

My friend has observed, that the senses sometimes contradict themselves, and instanced the cases of Joshua, and of the woman at the sepulchre, who supposed that the angels who appeared to them, were men. The onus is on Mr. Maguire to prove, that the angels presented themselves clothed with all the effulgence of celestial glory. No—they came in the habit and form of men ; and the senses so far gave a correct testimony.

Mr. Maguire has spoken of a stick appearing crooked in

water. I reply that the sense of touch would rectify that false testimony, as that sense would discover the stick to be straight. Mr. Maguire has justly observed, that the senses convey their testimony to the mind and judgment. That testimony, I beg to observe, directly refutes the doctrine of transubstantiation. The senses bearing witness that the bread is bread, and the wine is wine, the judgment pronounces correctly that the bread is bread and the wine is wine. Permit me also to add, that it scarcely ever happens, that *all* the senses are deceived at the same time; one sense may be deceived, but that is soon corrected by the exercise of some other.

Mr. Maguire reminds us, that "faith cometh by hearing." Faith cometh by reading too. How am I to know, that the words, "this is my body," are in the scriptures, if I do not exercise my senses? But if I am not to exercise my senses upon the elements, perhaps my senses altogether deceive me, when they inform me that the words, "this is my body," are contained in the sacred records! The doctrines of the Trinity and of the Incarnation are above sense. Man is incompetent to discover the modus of God's existence, or to explain *how* the Deity took upon him human flesh; but the senses of the wise men did not deceive them, when they *saw* an infant lying in the stable at Bethlehem.

My friend has rung changes on the priesthood of Melchisedech. He was a priest—but I have shown that he did not offer up bread and wine to God, but brought it forth for the *refreshment of Abraham and his followers;—his blessing Abraham* marked out his sacerdotal character. In the 7th chapter of Hebrews, Douay Bible, there is no mention made of Melchisedech having brought out bread and wine; it is simply said, that "he blessed Abraham."

My friend informed us, that he thought nothing of the scriptures in the original tongues; yet he has told us, that his church will allow them to be read in the originals. Must every old woman and every child apply themselves to the study of Greek and Hebrew? Mr. Maguire has observed, that the Italian Bible is more perfect than the Vulgate. The Trent doctors ought to be much obliged to him for this discovery. Bellarmine indeed informs us, that *the Fathers teach every where, that the Latin edition of the gospel is to be called back to the Greek fountains, and that the Latin edition of the Old Testament is to be amended by the Hebrew.* Some, 'tis true, asserted, when they saw the Latin vulgate printed between the Greek and Hebrew, on the same page, that the position of the Latin resembled that of the Saviour when he was crucified between two thieves.—(*Simon Crit.* t. v lib. 2, 14.)

But I must not forget that Berengarius, according to Mr Maguire, was the first who denied the doctrine of transubstantiation. We shall see whether this assertion is correct. My opponent informs us, that even the heretics believed in the doctrine of transubstantiation. I go farther—I imagine that transubstantiation is of heretical origin, and I now trace it up to Eutyches. In the second Dialogue of Theodoret, between an orthodox Christian, under the name of Orthodoxus, and a heretic, under the name of Eranistes; the latter maintaining, that the humanity of Christ was changed into the substance of the Divinity, thus illustrates the matter:—

"As (says Eranistes) the symbols of the Lord's body and blood are one thing before the invocation of the priest, but after the invocation, are changed and become another thing, so the body of our Lord, after his ascension, is changed into the divine substance."

Such was the opinion of Eutyches and his followers. I shall not mutilate the passage in reply, though I admit, that the language in the latter part of it is strong.

"Thou art (says Orthodoxus) caught in thine own net; because the mystical symbols after consecration DO NOT PASS OUT OF THEIR OWN NATURE, FOR THEY REMAIN IN THEIR FORMER SUBSTANCE, FIGURE, AND APPEARANCE, and may be seen and handled, even as before consecration; but they are understood to be what they become, and they are venerated as being those things, which they are believed to be. Compare, therefore, the IMAGE with the archetype, and you will perceive the *resemblance*, for the type must needs be similar to the truth."—(Dial. 2, Oper. vol. iv, p. 84, 85, Lutet. Paris, 1642.)

I ask, did not Theodoret oppose the doctrine of transubstantiation, when he calls the Sacrament an *image?* He lived in the fifth century. Again, Pope Gelasius, as you have seen, also wrote a work, which Mr. Maguire asserts, is spurious, against the Eutychian heresy, which seems to have aimed at the introduction of the doctrine of transubstantiation.

Did not Ephrem of Antioch, about the middle of the sixth century, oppose the doctrine of transubstantiation, when he says:

"No man of common sense will assert that the *nature* of things palpable and impalpable, visible and invisible, is the same—THUS THE BODY OF CHRIST WHICH IS RECEIVED BY THE FAITHFUL, DOES NOT DEPART FROM ITS OWN SENSIBLE SUBSTANCE, though by virtue of consecration it is united to a spiritual grace; and thus baptism, though a spiritual thing itself, yet preserves the water which is the property of its sensible substance; it loses not what it was before."—Ephrem Antioch. Cont. Eutych. Apud Phot. Cod. 229.

Facundus, in the 6th century, says:

"The sacrament of adoption may be called adoption, just as the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ, *which is the consecrated bread and wine*, we are wont to call his body and blood. *Not indeed that the bread is properly his body, or that the wine is properly his blood*, but because they contain the mystery of his body and blood within themselves; hence it was that our Lord

denominated the consecrated bread and wine which he delivered to his disciples, in his own body and blood."—(Facund. Defens. Concil. Chalced. lib. 12, c. 4, oper. p. 144.)

Was not Facundus, in the sixth century, opposed to the doctrine of transubstantiation?

Further—Rabanus Maurus, archbishop of Mentz, about the year 847, reciting the very words of Paschasius Radbert, of Corby, in which he broached the doctrine of transubstantiation, has this remarkable passage. Before, however, I read the quotation, permit me to remark, that Bellarmine and Sirmondus allow, that Paschasius was the first who wrote a regular treatise upon transubstantiation. Bellarmine says,

"This author was the first who had seriously and copiously written concerning the truth of Christ's body and blood in the Eucharist."—(De Script. Eccles.)

Sirmondus thus—

"He so first explained the genuine sense of the Catholic church, that he opened the way to the rest, who afterwards in great numbers wrote upon the same argument,"—(In vita Paschasii.)

The archbishop of Mentz, in the ninth century, writes,

"Some (says he) of late, not having a right opinion concerning the sacrament of the body and blood of our Lord, have said that this is the body and blood of our Lord, which was born of the Virgin Mary, and in which our Lord suffered upon the cross and rose from the dead; WHICH ERROR (says he) WE HAVE OPPOSED WITH ALL OUR MIGHT."—(Epist. ad Heribaldum, c. 33.)

Transubstantiation was also opposed by Heribaldus, Bishop of Auxerres in France, by John Scotus Erigena, (which means an Irishman) and Bertram of Corby. Bertram tells us in his preface, that

"They who according to their several opinions talked of the difficulties about Christ's body and blood, were divided with no small schism."

My friend has seen that Eutyches, the heretic, believed in transubstantiation, and that the doctrine was opposed by several writers, without any ecclesiastical fulmination having been directed against them. Even the second council of Nice, as has been already observed, declared, as one reason for worshiping the image of Christ, that he is not sensibly present on earth, and anathematized all who asserted, that Christ was not circumscribed as to his humanity. Several Roman Catholic writers virtually admit the modern origin of transubstantiation. Scotus allows, that the doctrine was not always considered as necessary to be believed, but that the necessity of believing it was consequent to the declaration of the church made in the council of Lateran, under Pope Innocent III.—In sent. L. 4, Dist 11, Q 3.

Durandus frankly discovers his inclination,

"To have believed the contrary, if the church had not by that determination obliged men to believe it."—In sent. L. 4, Dist. 11, Q. 1, N. 15.

Tonstal, Bishop of Durham, also admits, that

"Before the fourth Lateran council, men were at liberty as to the manner of Christ's presence in the sacrament."—De Euchar. lib. i, p. 146.

Erasmus, who lived and died in the Roman church, and than whom no man was better acquainted with the ancient Fathers, confesses that it was

"Late before the church defined transubstantiation, unknown to the ancients both name and thing."—1 Epist. ad Corinth. c. 7, Citante etiam Salmerone, tom. 9, tract 16, p. 168.

Alphonsus a Castro says, that

"Concerning the transubstantiation of the bread into the body of Christ, there is seldom any mention in the ancient writers."—De Hæres. lib. 8.

In connection with this subject, I meet the strange position of my friend relative to the Waldenses, namely, that they believed in transubstantiation, by a quotation from *Milner's End of Controversy:*

"It is incontestible, and carried to the highest degree of moral evidence, that all Christians, of all the nations of the world, Greeks as well as Latins, Africans as well as Europeans, except Protestants, and A HANDFUL OF VAUDOIS peasants, have in all ages believed, and still believe in the Real Presence and Transubstantiation."—London, 1824, 5th edit. p. 273.

Here Milner distinctly admits, that the Vaudois or Waldenses did not believe in transubstantiation.

The following is an extract from their Confession of Faith which was read publicly before Francis I, of France:

"We believe, that the holy sacrament of our Lord Jesus Christ's table is a sacred *memorial* and *an act of thanksgiving*, for the benefits which we have received by the death of Christ; and that it ought to be celebrated in the assembly of the saints, in faith and charity, and by an inward experience of Christ's merits. It is thus, by partaking of the bread and wine, we have communion with the body and blood of Christ, as we read in the holy scriptures."

Again, we read in the Confession of Faith of 1120.—Leger's History, p. 92.

"We believe, that after this life there are only two places, one for the saved, which is called Paradise, and one for the damned, which is called Hell, utterly denying that feigned purgatory of Antichrist, invented in opposition to truth."

"We believe that the sacraments are *signs* or the visible forms of holy things."

Did they offer masses for souls in purgatory, when they did not believe in its existence? I have referred to their standard formularies; and any one who will examine their history, as given by Mr. Gillie, will find additional proofs that they protested against the sacrifice of the mass.

Luther, Mr. Maguire says, is on his side. This is the first time in which I have heard, that consubstantiation is the same with transubstantiation. I confess, I am somewhat surprised, that most of the early reformers were enabled so easily to throw off *in toto* a doctrine which so closely adheres to persons brought up in the pale of the church of Rome. I do not justify the language which Luther employed when condemning those who wrote against his principles. Mr. Maguire has stated, that it is a spiritual body which is offered up in the mass. Does this opinion agree with the council of Trent? The council informs us that—

"*In the sacrifice of the mass, the same Christ is contained and unbloodily immolated, who once offered himself bloodily on the cross.*" Sess. 22. ch. 2.

Was it a spiritual body that suffered on Calvary? I deny that the devil is omnipresent. His influence is extended by the agency of innumerable spirits who are under his control. I did not circumscribe the presence of Christ. I believe, that, where two or three meet together in his name, He is in the midst of them. But, though he be present through the universe in his divinity, yet the heavens will receive his manhood till the time of the restitution of all things.—Acts, iii, 21. I have here the book of Sir Edwin Sandys. Mr. Maguire did not accept my offer, that a Protestant and a Roman Catholic should examine the work. Let them compare mine with Mr. Maguire's edition, and they will find mine to be the original volume.

My friend has talked of my having Trinity college at my back: it was not handsome to speak is this style. When Mr. Maguire expressed a wish to obtain access to a public library, I requested a friend to introduce him at Marsh's library; and I informed Mr. Maguire, that my friend was ready to accompany him thither. Did this circumstance look as if I wished to take any unfair advantage of Mr. Maguire? The passover, my opponent observes, was a type of Christ. The Lamb in the passover was indeed a type of the Saviour, not in transubstantiation, but of the body on Calvary. The passover was perhaps typical of the feast of the eucharist, which God's people celebrate in commemoration of their dying, risen, and glorified Redeemer.

Mr. MAGUIRE.—I have caught my friend, Mr. Pope, in the act of using garbled quotations. I have already asserted that he took his quotations *obstetricante manu*, and I now insist that I have detected him in making a false quotation. Before I shall expose either his disingenuity, or, what I rather suspect, his want of industry, I shall for a moment recur to the work ascribed to Gelasius, and give you the reasons which are assigned

to prove that it is not genuine. Pope Gelasius's work against Eutyches, is described by Genadius, lib. de. viris illust. cap. 14, as "*Grande et præclarum volumen.*" Now, in the first place, the present work is in no wise deserving of such a character. Secondly, in his Catholicorum Testimonia Magistrorum, he every where praises the Arians, and is profoundly silent about the orthodox Fathers. These considerations amount to a strong suspicion, that it could not have proceeded from the pen of Pope Gelasius, and it is therefore rationally considered as the production of Gelasius Cyzinicus.

I will now read to you the dialogue of Theodoret, who has been introduced as opposed to the doctrine of transubstantiation: let the following serve as a preface. He says,

"Christ at his last supper showed the true original of which this Paschal Lamb was a type; opened the gates of the holy sacrament; and *gave his most precious body and blood*, not only to the eleven Apostles, but also to the traitor Judas. These words, "He shall *be guilty of the body and blood* of the Lord," mean this, that as Judas betrayed him, and the Jews insulted him, so they offer him a very great affront who take his most holy body with *unclean hands* and put it into *a defiled mouth*."—In 1 Cor. cap. 11.

There is not any thing surely there contrary to the doctrine of transubstantiation. He proceeds to say, in his second dialogue, immediately after the words quoted by Mr. Pope—"The elements, after consecration, are to be *adored*." But Mr. Pope took good care to foist upon us the word *venerate* for the word *adore*, as if Theodoret had said, the elements after consecration are to be *venerated*, whereas he expressly says, they are to be *adored*. Mr. Pope, in his version, has substituted the word "*venerated*" for the word "*adored*" I charge him with a grievous mangling of the text. *Adored* is the word, as will be found by a reference to the original. If Theodoret denied transubstantiation, would he say that the elements of bread and wine after consecration are to be *adored?* Surely he would not tell us to *adore* a piece of bread and a drop of wine. Mr. Pope therefore should consign to execration the author by whom he was misled, for I am unwilling to believe that he would himself so distort the original, and seek to palm upon an unsuspecting public a text so monstrously garbled.

Theodoret in his dialogue, introduces Orthodoxus (a Catholic) and Eranistes (a heretic) disputing upon the Eucharist. Having previously disputed about the Eutychian heresy, concerning the two natures of Christ, (the Eutychians contending that the *humanity* was absorbed in the *divinity*,) Eranistes puts the following questions to Orthodoxus:—

"ERANISTES,—How do you call these (the elements) after consecration? ORTHODOXUS,—*The body and blood of Christ.*

ER.—Do you believe that you perceive the body and blood of Christ?
OR.—I do believe it.
ER.—Why are the names changed?
OR.—The reason is evident to those who understand the mystery; as Christ would not have us regard the *nature* of what we see, but as the names of the elements are changed, so to apprehend by faith the change which is made in them by *grace*. The mystical symbols after consecration do not depart from their own nature, but they are understood to be the things *which they are made*, and so they are *believed, and they are adored as being the things which they are believed.*"

Thus, it must be said, that Theodoret urged the idolatrous adoration of mere bread and wine, or that he believed and taught the doctrine of transubstantiation.

What are the things to be *believed* when the body and blood are *adored?* Is it to be believed that they remain bread and wine? What a wonderful effort of faith truly! But Orthodoxus tells us, that the things believed are to be *adored.*

The Fathers all agree in the doctrine of transubstantiation, and anathematize all those who controvert that doctrine. With regard to the parallel between Transubstantiation and the Trinity, my friend denies its existence, but I call upon him to prove that transubstantiation is not a mystery, as Theodoret calls it. He denies that transubstantiation is founded upon scripture. Christ, the eternal Son of a good and gracious God, made a wonderful promise in the sixth chapter of St. John, shall we say, after reading that solemn and divine promise, that he left nothing to us but a mere bit of bread and wine! Is it not evident, that he intended to leave with us a grand and noble gift worthy of the Testator, and in accordance with his omnipotence? Yet, if we are led by the Calvinistic doctrines, propounded by Mr. Pope, we must believe that he intended only to bequeath to us a mere bit of bread, and a drop wine! Would that be worthy of the Deity? Can such a belief be reconciled with the facts recorded in scripture? There we find that he raised the expectations of his disciples to the highest pitch, and that many of them went away shocked at his expressions. He did not correct their error, if such it were. When he came to his last supper, what did he say? There, while solemnly seated with his apostles, he raised his eyes to heaven, he took bread in his hands, blessed it, and broke it saying, "Take ye and eat—THIS IS MY BODY."

It is not my custom to lose my temper, and to indulge in harsh and angry expressions—I will not say, that I fling back with indignation any of the charges brought forward by my opponent. I have been taught to exercise a self-control, and I know that our Saviour tells us—"Love your enemies; do good to them that hate you; bless them that curse you, and pray for them that calumniate you! And to him that striketh thee on one cheek,

offer also the other." This is the *practical* part of Christianity It accords not with the suggestions of flesh and blood, nor with the maxims of modern gospel liberty. *Abnega teipsum* is the precept of the gospel, though it may form no portion of Mr. Pope's moral creed, By my forbearance upon this occasion, I shall furnish Mr. Pope with, at least, one instance of Christian humility. I may here remark, that one of the newspapers has, in the report of a former day's discussion, represented me as appropriating to myself, that which I quoted as the language of our Saviour—"Learn of me, because I am meek and humble of heart."

With regard to the senses, my friend has said, that they cannot all contradict themselves. But a portion may, and I made an exception for the sense of hearing. I referred in support of that portion to St. Paul—"Faith cometh by *hearing*, and hearing by the words of Christ."—(Rom. x, 17.) Hearing then is the only sense constituted as a judge of mysteries. But I ask, did not all the senses contradict themselves, when our Saviour walked upon the waters, and it is recorded of his disciples—"*Putaverent Phantasma esse.*" Did not the senses here deceive the Apostles, as they did others, in several cases in the Old Testament? They did not contradict themselves in the strict sense of the word. The matters which they related were not founded on fact, but they related what appeared to themselves. So far their relation was correct. My friend says, that the mistake into which the sense of sight falls as to the stick in the water may be corrected by the sense of touch. But if one sense contradicts another *in rebus natur alibus*, how much more likely to do so in things of a supernatural order?

He asks me how do I know that Christ spoke the words, "This is my body"—which he has unsuccessfully endeavoured to explain away. I answer, that I depend here upon the authority of the church of Christ. Mr. Pope depends on the translators of the Bible in the reign of James I. I place my reliance upon an authority to which our divine Redeemer expressly promised infallibility. Mr. Pope believes in no church, but relies upon his own private judgment. I called upon him to show how a Protestant could, according to his principles, make an act of faith. Has he ever answered the question?

He recurs to Melchisedech. But here I have him caught in his own net, as in the instance of Theodoret. He says that Melchisedech made no offering—I proved that he made an offering of bread and wine. St. Jerome maintains the same opinion, and St. Paul evidently alludes to it when he speaks of our Saviour being "a priest for ever according to the order of Melchisedech." Mr. Pope talks of my admission, that there is no

prohibition to the reading of the scriptures in the three sacred languages, Hebrew, Greek, and Latin, because portions of scripture have been published in each of them. In respect to the vulgar tongues, the church never prohibited the reading of the sciptures in them. She restricted the right where she though it would be abused; she restricted it in order to prevent the multiplication of heresies, and the generation of sects, such as the Anabaptists, the Muggletonians, and hundreds of others, who, like a swarm of locusts, or the ten plagues of Egypt, infest the country, distract the community, and rend asunder the Protestant churches. It was to guard against such evils that the Catholic church wisely forbade the indiscriminate reading of the scriptures. Mr. Pope has accused our translation of the Bible as being filled with various errors, Yet when the "saints" travel through the country, they would persuade the poor people that there is no difference between our Bible and theirs. But when they come to speak to scholars on the subject, they will have it that thousands of errors exist in our Bible. They then openly tell rank falsehoods to promote their cause—I do not accuse Mr. Pope of rank falsehood. But is it not evident from this, that there is neither honour nor veracity amongst the generality of the "saints"? He says, that by reason of the admissions which I have made, I would be called to an account if an inquisition existed in this country; and that moreover I would be excruciated for my heterodoxy. But Protestants are in general very little acquainted with our religion. They have through their ignorance transformed our faith into an hideous caricature.

He says that the Italian version was admitted by me to be superior to the Latin Vulgate. I deny the assertion. I said, that the Italian version was admitted to be the purest copy of the Bible extant—it was for that reason that St. Jerome, as he admits in his preface, followed the Italian version, and upon it laid the foundation of the Latin Vulgate. Where is the contradiction now?

Mr. Pope quoted a Catholic writer to prove that Christ was not sensibly present in the sacrament. I never said that Christ was sensibly present in the sacrament. Let Mr. Pope remember that Scotus, the author from whom he quotes, was condemned by the Catholic church for many of his positions, which are far from being deemed orthodox. As to Erasmus, there are some of his opinions not very orthodox, though he, like Henry VIII, thought it safest to die in the Catholic church.—Like many of the present day, who, in the enjoyment of youth and riches, cast their derisions at Popery, and yet are glad, when their end approaches, to return to the mother church.

Mr. Pope introduces Durandus. It is true he held opinions

contrary to those of the church, till the definition of the church was declared. Then he yielded as he ought to the authority of the Catholic church, as the illustrious Fenelon did in later days. I asserted that the first of the Waldenses preserved the sacrifice of the mass. But their followers changed their principles, as those of Luther and Calvin did; the Lutherans preaching one doctrine and the Calvinists another. Here, for instance, Mr. Pope admits only *eighteen* out of the *thirty-nine* articles of the church of England—others will be found to deny them altogether, and more will reject the Anthanasian creed. Such are the multiplied gradations produced by evangelical liberty and private judgment. It is found necessary by Mr. Pope to connect himself with with the Waldenses (perhaps the maddest of all heretics.) I would beg leave to ask him, had the Waldenses a church, a ministry, a liturgy, or any other mark of the true church of Christ, or indeed of any church at all, and if not, from whom did he receive the scriptures? I must here remark, that his obtrusive connexion with the Waldenses cannot add respectability to his origin. The Waldenses were one rotten branch lopped from the parent trunk by the Catholic church. I regret extremely I did not bring the ecclesiastical tree along with me.

[*Here Mr. Pope handed to Mr. Maguire Dr. Milner's "End of Controversy," containing the ecclesiastical tree.*]

Oh! I perceive, gentlemen, to my great surprise, that this tree, instead of exhibiting a naked trunk, is weighed down by those branches which I thought had been cut off, but which seem determined to cling with desperation to that parent stock upon which alone their vitality depends, but from which they can never more receive sap or nutriment, by means of that moral separation which originated with themselves. Here are Cerinthus, Arius, Montanus, Apollinaris, Manicheus, Eutyches, Pelagius, Socinus, Huss, Wickliffe, Waldo, Luther, Cranmer, struggling to connect themselves with the Catholic church, and claiming, upon some occasions, a sympathetic relationship with each other. How, now, Mr. Pope, will you or the present Protestant church be able to stitch yourselves to those various heretics? Were they, I demand, or were they not, more different from the principles of the present reformers than they were from the Catholic church; and would not the ancient heretics anathematize Mr. Pope and his doctrines as jealously as the Catholic church herself?

Before I conclude, I will give you a few additional quotations from the Fathers, touching the faith of the primitive church. St. Cyril of Alexandria, commenting on John, tom. iv, p. 252, after quoting the words of St. John, "I am the living bread that came down from heaven,"—(vi, 51.)

"The manna was the type, the shadow, and the image. 'I am the living bread, if any one shall eat of this bread, he shall live for ever.' They that eat of the manna are dead, because it gave not life; he that eats this bread, that is me, or my flesh, shall live for ever. Our Lord Jesus, by his own flesh, gives life to us, and his blood is not that of any common man, but the natural blood of life itself. 'For he that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood abideth in me and I in him.'—(John, vi, 56.) As he that joins wax to wax forms of them one body, so it seems to me, he that eats the flesh of our Saviour, and drinks his precious blood, as himself says, becomes one with him. Let these verbose and absurd men tell us with whose body the sheep of the church are fed, or from what springs her children are refreshed. For if the body of God is delivered, thus God is the true God, Christ the Lord, not a mere man, nor an angel, as some pretend. And if it be the blood of God, the cup of God, this God is not purely God, one of the adorable Trinity, the Son of God *but the Word of God made man.* But if the body of Christ be our food, and the blood of Christ our drink, and this Christ be a mere man, how is eternal life promised to those who approach the holy table? And how again shall this body be divided here, and in *many places*, and not be diminished? A mere body cannot impart life to those who receive it. Wherefore let us receive the body of life itself; that life which for us has dwelt in our body: and let us drink his sacred blood for the remission of our sins, and so partake of that immortality which is in him; believing Christ to be the priest and the victim, him that offers, and he that is offered."

St. John Chrysostom, Hom. ii, ad Pop. Antioch, I. i, p. 37—

"Elias left his garment to his disciple: but the Son of God left us his own flesh. The prophet, indeed, threw off his covering, but Christ ascending, took with him his body and *left it also for us.* Let us not therefore repine, nor fear any difficulties, for he who refused not to shed his blood for all, and communicated to us his body and blood, what will he not do for our salvation?"

And, Hom. ii, in cap. 14. Matt. i, 7.—

"Let us then touch the hem of his garment, or rather let us, if we be so disposed, possess him entire, for his body now lies before us, not to be touched only, but to be eaten and to satiate us. And if they who touched his garment drew so much virtue from it, how much more shall we draw who possess him whole? When, therefore, thou seest the priest presenting the body to thee, think not that it is *his* hand, but the *hand of Christ* that is stretched towards thee."

So, gentlemen, that objection of Mr. Pope is here fully answered, viz,—that the priest made his God--for here St. Chrysostom declares, that the action is not performed by man, but by Christ himself—which agrees with St. Cyril, that Christ is both the priest and the victim.

Mr. POPE.—My friend has drawn a strange distinction between outward appearances and species. The schoolmen, borrowing from Aristotle, introduced a curious fancy; they supposed, that the universe consisted of a mass of matter, invested by certain forms and qualities which possess a real and substantial being. This was a very fortunate discovery for the school divines; it served to explain the bodily presence of Christ in the sacrament; the substance of the bread and wine, said they, is converted into his body and blood; but the absolute accidents, the substantia

forms of both remain as before; hence the term transubstantiation. Now surely it is most ridiculous to assert, that that which has all the properties of bread, should not be bread; and that that which has none of the properties of flesh, should be flesh. I am not quite so certain that the gravy is the blood of the animal; however, I congratulate Mr. Maguire upon the strict observance of the washing of feet in the church of Rome. Upon a certain day, I am informed that a golden ewer is prepared, and the Pope washes the feet of some mendicants. I wish to know does Mr. Maguire follow the example of his holiness at Rome

My friend observes, that Christ can extricate himself from the elements, if likely to corrupt. Let us examine the Roman Missal upon this head.

"If through negligence any part of the blood of Christ should fall upon the ground or upon the table, let it be licked up, and let the place be sufficiently scraped, and the scrapings burned, but let the ashes be buried in holy ground. But if it should fall upon the stone of the altar, let the priest drink up the drop, and let the place be well washed, and the washing thrown into holy ground. If the drop should reach the first, second, and third linen-cloth, let the cloths be three times washed where the drop fell, the chalice having been placed under, and let the water of ablution be thrown into holy ground. But if it should fall only on the sacerdotal vestments themselves, they ought in the same manner be washed, and the washing thrown into holy ground. If it should fall upon the cloth or the carpet placed underneath the feet, let it be well washed as before. If it should happen, that all the blood should be poured forth after consecration, if indeed any, even a little, shall remain, let that be taken, and let that which has been mentioned be done with the remainder of the blood. But if none shall remain, let the priest place wine in the chalice again, and let him consecrate it from that place 'likewise after supper;' the oblation, however, of the chalice having been made as before If the priest should disgorge the eucharist, if the species should appear entire, let them be reverently taken, if nausea does not prevent; in that case, let the consecrated species be cautiously separated, and laid up in some secret place, until they become corrupted; and afterwards let them be thrown into holy ground. But if the species do not appear, let that be burned which has been disgorged, and the ashes thrown into holy ground. If the consecrated host, or any part of it, fall upon the ground, let it be reverently taken up, and the place where it fell, cleansed, and a little scraped, and let the dust, o scrapings of that nature, be thrown into holy ground. If it should fall without the corporal upon the napkin or in any manner upon any cloth, let the napkin or cloth be carefully washed, and let the washing itself be poured out upon holy ground."—*De defect. circ. Miss. occ. Miss. Rom.* 1822, Dubl.

Pardon me for having read so much, and excuse me for not reading the whole. I wonder, why such a process should be enjoined, if the Saviour's body is supposed not to be present after the decomposition of the elements!

I have already proved, that the difficulty of convincing the Socinian, is greater on the part of Mr. Maguire than on mine. I observed, that I could argue on the scriptures, as acknowledged by the Socinian, while my friend would refer him to the *universal consent of mankind.* Now we have shown, that Arianism at one

period prevailed in the church of Rome; the Socinian will therefore, reply, that he too has tradition on his side; he will therefore wish Mr. Maguire good morning, when he introduces the infallibility and authority of his church. If my friend's quotations from Protestant bishops be correct, I can only say that they were not true to their principles, for the articles of the established church, emphatically assert, that the elements should not be adored. We are told, that there is a difference between a mystery and a miracle. Let the opinion go forth, and stand as a ruled case, that there is no miracle in transubstantiation. Some of the Fathers, I allow, used strong expressions respecting the eucharist. If Theodoret believed in transubstantiation, he could not have met, in the way in which he does, the argument of Eutyches. He spoke of a *moral*, but not a *physical* change, and conceived that the moral change, which, he believed, took place, entitled the elements to respect and veneration. Mr. Maguire asks, did Christ leave behind him nothing but bread and wine? Yes; he has bequeathed to his people the records of inspiration, which bear witness to his glorious work on Calvary, when he bowed his head and gave up the ghost. I asked Mr. Maguire, how he knew that the words, "this is my body," are to be found in the Bible. I am told, by the authority of his church. Now, the examination of the proofs of this authority, demands the exercise of sense; and if so, why should not the same exercise of sense be admitted upon transubstantiation? I employed strong language, 'tis true, in refutation of the charge which Mr. Maguire brought against me—but believe me, I did not speak under the impulse of passion. Mr. Maguire has directed me to himself as an example of humility. I appeal to the present meeting, whether we have not had a singular exhibition of effrontery on his part, in defiance of common sense and rational argumentation? My friend has referred us to the instance of the Saviour having been taken for a spirit; but he should remember, that at the moment the Apostles did not distinctly see him; but as soon as they *heard* his *voice*, they cried out, "it is the Lord." As to an act of faith being made by a Protestant, I shall not go over the same ground so often travelled before. Mr. Maguire observes, that St. Paul applies the term priest to Melchisedech: but this circumstance does not prove the bread and wine to have been a sacrifice. The truth of this observation can be seen, as I have already said, by consulting the Old Testament. I called upon Mr. Maguire to prove, that the term ιερευς, a sacrificing priest, was ever applied to the ministers of Christ in the new dispensation; he has not met that question. I again assert, that there is no ιερευς on earth, possessing any authority under the Christian dispensation. The

priesthood of Christ is unchangeable, and therefore not to be transferred; that of the Jews was changeable, because they were subject to death. The priesthood is now concentrated in him, who sits for ever on the right hand of the Majesty in the Heavens. My friend has remarked, that Protestants assert, that there is no difference between the Roman Catholic and Protestant Bible; the Douay version, I admit, though corrupted, still retains fundamental truths. You shall hear Dr. Doyle's opinion of the Protestant translation:—

"Q. Do you consider the authorized translation of the church of England as of a sufficiently perverse quality, to merit the description, (given in the encyclical letter of the Pope, dated Rome, May 3, 1824,—that by a perverse interpretation, the gospel of Christ may be turned into a human gospel, or what is worse, into the gospel of the devil?)

"A. As I said before, God forbid I should so consider it; for though it has many errors, *I consider it one of the noblest translations that ever has been produced;* this, I say, while looking upon it, as abounding with inaccuracies, and having many errors."—*App. to Report for Com. on Education in Ireland*, p. 791.

In the opinion of Dr. Doyle, we perceive, that the authorized version is one of the noblest translations that ever has been produced. I still insist, that, in several instances, the translations in the authorized version, regarded by Ward as erroneous, have been adopted by Dr. Murray, in his edition of the Douay Bible lately published. (See Hamilton's Letters to the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Dublin, on the State of the present English R. C. Bible.)

Mr. Maguire persists in saying, that the Waldenses believed in transubstantiation. In refutation of the assertion, I have read to you extracts from their creeds, and a passage from Dr. Milner's End of Controversy. You have heard much of the Apostolic tree in Dr. Milner. You will find, upon examination, however, that the mention of some Popes is altogether omitted. To change the metaphor—I should like to know, when the links were broken in the Apostolic chain, for instance, at the time of the council of Constance, by what process the spiritual Vulcan was able to join them together again? My friend has talked of the Waldenses being heretics. I have already referred you to the commendation of Lewis XII, and the report of his commissioners which prove that the Waldenses held the truths of the blessed gospel. As to Mr. Maguire's quotation from Luther, I can prove that that which Mr. Maguire says, was a literal conversation with the devil, is merely figurative. Sagittarius proves, that Justus Jonas, Luther's colleague, who translated this piece of Luther's writings into Latin, left out many words, particularly the following passage:

"*Meo corde*, multas enim noctes mihi acerbas fecit."

Which ought immediately to follow the first sentence—

"Satan mecum cœpit ejusmodi disputationem."

So that in English the translation should be:

"Satan began with me *in my heart* the following disputation."

As to the quotations from the works of other reformers which Mr. Maguire adduced, the places where they may be found, not having been stated by him, I may truly say that they are so absurd as to carry their own refutation upon their very face.

With respect to the doctrine of transubstantiation: I have shown that our Saviour did not always speak literally—that he frequently employed figurative language—that there is a figure in the very context—that the Syriac language possesses no word meaning *to signify*, and that therefore our Lord was under the necessity of using the auxiliary verb. I observed that, if transubstantiation be true, we can have no proof of the resurrection of Christ—that it destroys the nature of a sacrament, and contradicts the scripture which asserts, that the body of Christ shall not see corruption. I have appealed to the Fathers; let our quotations be confronted. There is a suspicion that the Fathers have been corrupted by the church of Rome; but the Protestants possess no *index expurgatorius*. I would ask, what is the use of the doctrine of transubstantiation? Can the body and blood of Christ, literally received into the body, benefit the soul? Christ suffered in his body on the cross, and in that respect his flesh has profited, from its union with the Godhead. But did I submit to be a cannibal, I should yet have to learn, by what process an immaterial spirit can be benefited by a material substance. I appeal to your judgments; which is most in accordance with common sense, reason, scripture, and the character of God,—the doctrine which holds that a man eats his Redeemer, or that which teaches, that the soul is fed, not by *eating* the symbols of the body and blood of Christ, but by *the truths* contained in the word of God? If the early Christians believed such a doctrine, I ask, would it not have been brought forward as a charge against them by anti-Christian writers?—(Iren. Fragm. ap. Œcum. in 1 Pet. ii, 12.) Yet such a charge was never made.

My friend has accused me of not being under the influence of moral principle. Let our lives be contrasted, and then will it be seen which of the two is most influenced by Christian principle. If Mr. Maguire would read the works of Luther, he would find, that although Luther would lay no other foundation than that which has been laid, which is Christ Jesus the Lord, yet he delighted to erect upon that basis such a moral edifice as should be to the praise and the glory of the most high God. I

maintain that in the New Testament ιερευς is never applied to Christian ministers; and I argue against the Roman Catholic priesthood as St. Paul argued against that of the Jews.—Heb. x.

"The law having a shadow of the good things to come, not the very image of the things, by the self-same sacrifices, which they offer continually every year, can never make the comers thereunto perfect. Because the worshippers once cleansed should have no conscience of sin any longer. But in them there is made a commemoration of sins every year; for it is impossible that with the blood of oxen and goats sin should be taken away."

Again,

"And every priest, indeed, standeth daily ministering and often offering the same sacrifices which can never take away sins; but this man offering *one* sacrifice for sins, for ever sitteth at the right hand of God, from henceforth expecting until his enemies be made his footstool, for by *one oblation* he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified. And the Holy Ghost also doth testify this to us, for after that he said, 'this is the Testament which I will make unto them after those days, saith the Lord, I will give my laws in their hearts, and on their minds will I write them, and their sins and iniquities I will remember no more. Now, when there is a remission of these, there IS NO MORE AN OBLATION FOR SIN."

In the same manner I argue, that the daring repetition of the sacrifice of Christ implies, that the great atonement on the cross was not all-sufficient—this is an important subject. St. Paul plainly observes, that in the repetition of the Jewish sacrifices there was a public acknowledgment made that sin remained unpardoned. The Jewish priests offered often the same sacrifices, which can never take away sin. The Roman Catholic priesthood, in the daring attempt to offer a sacrifice, first proclaim the sacrifice of Christ as insufficient; and secondly, acknowledge their own as insufficient, by repeating *it*. Mark the contrast—

"The Priest stood daily ministering, and often offering the same sacrifices, which can never take away sin: but this man offering ONE SACRIFICE for sins for ever sitteth on the right hand of God, from henceforth expecting, until his enemies be made his footstool."

Why does the Saviour not repeat his sacrifice? Because "by ONE oblation he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified." Wherefore, after the announcement of the new covenant the Apostle adds:

"Where there is a remission of these, THERE IS NO MORE AN OBLATION FOR SIN."

The Church of Rome must hold that the remission is either perfect or imperfect. The latter I bring in direct opposition to the sacred scriptures,

"Their sins and iniquities I will remember *no more*."

Again, it is written,

"Nor yet that he should offer himself *often*, as the high priest entereth into the holiest every year with the blood of others; for then he ought to have

suffered OFTEN from the beginning of the world; but now ONCE at the end of ages, he hath appeared for the destruction of sin by the sacrifice of himself; and as it is appointed unto men once to die, and after that the judgment, so also Christ was offered ONCE to exhaust the sins of many."—(Heb. ix, 24.)

There are other passages to the same effect, which show that there is but one priest, Christ Jesus, God over all, blessed for ever. Therefore they who pretend to offer sacrifice, intrude upon his office, and attempt to rob him of his priesthood. But he remains eternally and immutably the great High Priest of his people.

SIXTH DAY—Wednesday, April 25.

SUBJECT.—"*The Protestant Churches do not profess that Unity which forms the Distinctive Mark of the True Church of Christ.*"

ADMIRAL OLIVER and THOMAS WYSE, Esq., in the Chair.

Mr. MAGUIRE rose, and called upon Mr. Pope, for proofs of the existence of that unity in the Protestant churches, which forms the distinctive mark of the true church of Christ.

Mr. POPE rose, and said—Gentlemen, I shall preface my observations this day, with the following remarks: If I yesterday spoke in a manner apparently bordering upon warmth, I beg to assure you, that it arose from excessive bodily exhaustion, which obliged me, in order to give utterance to my thoughts, unduly to strain and exert my physical powers.

Mr. Maguire has called upon me for proofs of that unity which he asserts to be a distinctive mark of the true church. I admit that no single Protestant communion constitutes of itself the church of Christ, but that the members of the Saviour's mystical body are scattered through the various communities of professing Christians. This, my opinion of the meaning of "the the church of Christ," coincides with authorities which my friend esteems. St. Augustin says of the church,

"That house consists in vessels of gold and silver in precious stones, and incorruptible wood; and it is to that St. Paul says, 'bear with one another in love, keeping the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace;' and again, 'the temple of God is holy, which temple ye are.' *It consists in the good, in the faithful, in the holy servants of God spread every where,* joined together in a spiritual unity by the communion of the same sacraments, whether they know one another by sight or whether they do not. But as for the others, they are so in the house as not at all to belong to the structure of the house, and they

are not in that society that is faithful in peace and righteousness. They are as chaff amid the good corn; and we cannot deny that they are in the house, since the Apostle says, 'that there are in the house not only vessels of gold and silver, but vessels also of wood and earth—but one to honor, the other to dishonor.' —August. de Baptis. Contra. Donat. lib. vii, cap. 51.

You have already perceived that the quotations which I brought forward on the first day of the meeting, coincide with this view of the word Church. Clemens of Alexandria says:

"The ancient Catholic church is but one only, which assembles in the unity of one only faith, by the will of one only God, and the ministry of one only Lord—all those who are before obtained, that is to say, whom God has predestinated to be just, having known them before the foundation of the world."—Clem. Alex. Strom. lib. vii.

Origen says, in explaining these words, "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock will I build my church."—

"The church consists of all those who are perfect, and are full of those words, thoughts, and actions which lead to blessedness."

In Matt. xvi, St. Ambrose says,

"God called his tabernacle Bethlehem, because the church of the righteous is his tabernacle; and there is a mystery in it; for Bethlehem is situated upon the sea of Gallilee, on the east side, which signifies to us that *every* soul that is worthy to be called the temple of God, or the church, may be built upon the waves of this world, but can never be drowned; it may be encountered, but can never be overthrown, because it depresses and calms the wild impetuousness of sufferings. It looks upon the shipwrecks of others, while itself is safe from danger, always ready to receive the illumination of Jesus Christ, and to rejoice under his rays."—De Abrah. Patr. Lib. 1, 2. cap. 3.

And further, elsewhere, he says expressly:

"That as the saints are the members of Jesus Christ, so the wicked are the members of the devil."—In Psalm xxxv.

St. Jerome says:

"*The church, which is the assembly of all the saints,* is called in the scripture the pillar and ground of truth, because she has in Jesus Christ an eternal firmness."—In. Job cap. xxvi.

Again, in the exposition of the Canticles, he says:

"That *the church is the assembly of all the saints,* and that she is brought in speaking in the Canticles, as if all the saints were but one person."—Cant. Rom. I.

And even the author of the Commentary on the Psalms, ascribed to St. Jerome, explaining these words of the prophet, "I will drive away from the city of the Lord all workers of iniquity," says:

"The city of the Lord *is the church of the saints, the congregation of the just.*"—In Psal. ci.

You will perceive from the quotations, whether Mr. Maguire's view of the word "church" coincides with that entertained by Christian antiquity.

Permit me to observe, that unity, abstractedly considered, is not a distinctive feature of the church of Christ. There may be unity in error, as well as unity in truth. The unity which is to distinguish the church of Christ, consists in holding the essentials of sound doctrine. In order to explain my meaning, permit me to read part of the 2d psalm:

"The kings of the earth stood up, and the princes met together against the Lord, and against his Christ."—v. 2.

Here we read of unity; but need I say, that it was unity founded on error. If *mere* unity be the essential characteristic of the true church, the Jewish church will boast that it possesses this mark: she will say, 'Christians are divided into many sects and parties: there is the church of Rome, with her Dominicans and Franciscans, her Jesuits and Jansenists; there are the Protestant communions, differing on points of external discipline—the Episcopalians, Presbyterians, Independents, and Baptists. Christians cannot, therefore, constitute the true church. We are united; hence we are the true church.' Again: the Mahomedan, looking at those who possess the sacred scriptures, perceives that the Jews receive but a portion of them, and that Christians receive the New Testament in addition, and that both differ on various points; he will conclude, that, if unity be a mark of the true church, the Jews and Christians cannot constitute it: "my church," he will say, "is united, therefore it is the true church." Again: may not the Hindoo, on this principle, when he sees the Jews receiving only the Old Testament, the Christians both Testaments, and the Mahomedan, though acknowledging Christ to be a prophet sent by heaven, denying his divinity—declare, "if unity be the mark of the true church, their's is not the true church, but mine is." The Infidel, too, may congratulate himself, when he perceives that those who profess to believe in revealed religion differ so widely. May he not say, "if unity be a mark of the true church, believers in what they call a revelation do not possess that mark; therefore they are not the true church; but we are united: therefore we are the true church." And lastly, the Atheist may step forward and observe, 'here are Jews, Christians, Mahomedans, Hindoos, and Infidels, all professing to believe in a preternatural power, and yet widely differing from each other: if unity, therefore, be an essential mark of the true church, the Atheistical church is that church."

You perceive, that *mere* unity is not the distinctive mark of the true church; but unity in sound doctrine. Here the whole argument turns; and I boldly assert, that whatever unity is to be found in the church of Rome, is a unity, not of sound doctrine, but of erroneous doctrines.

Hear the Fathers upon this point, that real unity consists in sound doctrine:

"They do not," says Ambrose, "possess the inheritance of Peter, who do not hold the faith of Peter."—De Pœnit. cap. 6.

Tertullian observes,

"True unity is the consanguinity of faith and doctrine."—De Præscr. pt adv. Hær. cap. 33.

Mr. Maguire asserted, that the church of Rome did differ upon matters not essential, but that its unity consisted in essential doctrines.—Now I think essential and fundamental doctrines are synonymous terms. What is the opinion of Delahogue upon this distinction between fundamental and non-fundamental articles?

"Jam manifestum est distinctionem articulorum fundamentalium et nor fundamentalium merum esse commentum, scripturis evidentur repugnans, toti traditioni ignotum, et in desperatæ causæ præsidium a Juricœo excogitatum."—P. 16.

"It is now manifest, that the distinction between fundamental and non-fundamental articles is a mere comment, evidently opposed to scripture, unknown to tradition altogether, and invented by Juriæus, as the last resource of a desperate cause."

I wonder whether Mr. Maguire is at unity with Delahogue on this subject; and we know that Delahogue is the class-book of Maynooth. We assert, as a positive matter of fact, that all the great Protestant communions in their published confessions, are agreed on the essential truths of the Christian system. First, as to the head of the church—they hold that Christ is head over all things to his church, God over all, blessed for ever. They are agreed upon the standard of faith—the Bible, and the Bible alone, is the religion of Protestants.

I hold in my hand a book entitled "Corpus et Suntagma Confessionum," &c. A Body and Collation of the Confessions of Faith, which were authenticated, and edited in the name of the Churches in different kingdoms and nations, published in the most famous convention, and approved of by public authority," &c. 1512.

Any gentleman who pleases may examine the work; he shall have it for the purpose. From it he will discover, that the great Protestant communions coincide on the canon of scripture, in their views of the guilt and natural depravity of man, and on that great fundamental truth, that the sinner is justified by faith only, in the atonement of the Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ,—that they harmonize on the doctrine of the necessity of a change of heart, ere the soul can be admitted into the kingdom of glory—that they accord in the scriptural truth, that the faith of the gospel opens the affections, purifies the inmost recesses of the soul, emancipates the believer from the overwhelming influence of the world, binds him by the strongest moral obligations—

in a word, consecrates him to be a vessel meet for his master's use. These are the great essential truths on which all real Protestants agree. In support of these fundamental tenets, I appeal to that blessed volume in which, to use the words of Bellarmine,

"All things necessary for all are written by the Apostles."
"Dico illa omnia scripta esse ab Apostolis quæ sunt omnibus necessaria, &c."—*De Verbo non Scripto*, Lib. iv, c, 11.

To the Apostolic records I appeal, in support of these doctrines; and to the printed confessions of faith, in demonstration that on essential doctrines Protestant communions are found to accord. Having made these few observations on the unity subsisting between the Protestant communions, I throw back upon my friend the charge of want of unity in his own church. I assert that his church has not unity in reference to the standard of faith, in reference to doctrine, and various other points—to which I shall presently take the liberty of calling your attention.

My friend will tell you, doubtless, that his church possesses one head, as the source and centre of unity—that the Pope, as successor to St. Peter, is supreme. But it will devolve on him to prove, that Peter was the supreme Apostle, and that the Popes are his successors. I shall assign my reasons for the opinion, that Peter did not possess jurisdiction over the other Apostles. Peter was specially the Apostle of the Jews, and was not appointed to watch over the Gentile church. Paul was the Apostle of the Gentiles, and if any on that ground could lay claim to supremacy, the Apostle Paul was the individual. Mark the absurdity into which this doctrine of Peter's supremacy would lead us. St. John survived Peter about twenty years. If this prerogative therefore belongs to the bishop of Rome, we should have an uninspired man, whether Linus, or Clement exercising jurisdiction over an inspired Apostle?

The Apostles, permit me to add, never recognized Peter as supreme. At the last supper we find them disputing which of them should be the greatest. Had they conceived that the Saviour, in the passage, "Thou art Peter," &c, had conferred superiority upon him, is it likely that such a dispute could have arisen amongst them? And if the Saviour had conferred any such authority upon Peter, would he not have referred the Apostles to his previous decision, in order to terminate the disputation: but he simply inculcates upon them a lesson of humility (Luke, xxii, 24.) When the Apostles had found that Samaria had received the Word of God, "they sent unto them Peter and John."—(Acts, viii, 14.) The inferior confessedly is sent by the superior, and therefore neither Peter nor John were above the other Apostles At the first assembly in Jerusalem, though

Peter and James both delivered their opinions, yet the opinion of James, and not that of Peter, was received by the assembly. (Acts, xv, 13.) And in the letter which was subsequently written, there is no mention whatever made of Peter. The decree thus commences,

"The Apostles and ancient brethren, to the brethren of the Gentiles."—v. 33.

The Apostle Paul talks of schisms—

"Every one of you saith, I am of Paul, I of Apollos, and I of Cephas."—1 Cor. i, 12.

True, you will say, it was wrong to assert that they were under Paul or Apollos: but, I ask, what think you of "I am of Cephas or Peter?" *I ask, if Peter was the supreme apostle, would Paul have condemned the Corinthian Christians for putting themselves under the standard of the supreme head?* Further—if to have one *earthly* head be the essential characteristic of the true Church, the Church in the primitive times did not possess this centre of unity. No bishop assumed the title of supreme until Boniface III, in the year 606. Nay—this centre of unity has been the pregnant source of divisions in the church of Rome. We read of more than twenty schisms arising from the Popedom. At one period we find Pope fulminating against Pope for a seri of years. Stephen VI, abrogated the decrees of Pope Formosus his predecessor, drew his body out of his sepulchre, cut off his fingers, because they had been used in ordination, and threw them into the Tiber; alleging as a reason, that he obtained Peter's chair by perjury. Romanus, the next Pope, abrogated all the decrees of his predecessor, Stephen; and as Platina observes, this quarrel had such an injurious influence, that every following Pope infringed, or wholly abrogated the acts of the foregoing.

Again—the church of Rome is split on the subject of the temporal power of the Popes, also on infallibility. What shall we say of the heretical heads which have presided over the church of Rome. Pope Honorius was deposed for heresy by a general council. It is, indeed, a daring assumption on the part of man, to take on him an office which is the exclusive prerogative of the Lord Jesus Christ, which no *earthly* being, however extensive his information, correct his principles, and mighty his intellectual powers may be, should dare to assume, an office which no combination of talents, however exalted, could qualify him to discharge.

Mr. MAGUIRE.—You have heard, gentlemen, perhaps the best defence which could possibly be set up for the Protestant churches As to unity, I contend, that it is required by scripture as a mark of that peace which Christ bequeathed to his

followers—"My peace I leave with you—my peace I give you,"—and as a token of that holiness which our Lord intended should, until the consummation of ages, characterize the true church upon earth. You have heard the most ingenious defence which could be offered for the absence of all unity; and you cannot have failed to observe that Mr. Pope has employed his usual tact on this occasion. I had put him on his defence as to a certain point of doctrine. I had left the ground clear for him. But, instead of confining himself to the maintenance of his own principles on this particular point, and to an anticipation of my objections, he turns upon me, and, as has been his invariable practice, puts me upon my defence. In that respect Mr Pope deserves much credit for his ingenuity. I had hoped that the discussion would terminate this day with good humour and good feeling. Some expressions dropped from my opponent yesterday, which might as well have been spared. In stating my arguments as to Mr. Pope's principles, I confined myself to the proof their inconsistency with the moral precepts of the gospel. Though I took care that my arguments as to morality should be confined to the principles, and not addressed to the individual, my opponent has in return made personal allusions to my moral character. This I will say, that the comparison which my friend, Mr. Pope, has drawn between his moral character and mine, was not provoked by any observation that had fallen from me. I would not, however, shrink from such an investigation at any time, that it might be shown to be calculated to serve any good or useful purpose. I have endeavoured through life, though, indeed, I cannot lay claim to the title of "saint," to square my conduct agreeably to the maxims of the gospel; and I believe I may say, that in the habits of social intercourse, neither my Protestant nor Catholic friends have had any thing to complain of on my part. Mr. Pope has told me, and he laid great stress on the observation, that there is no such expression in the New Testament as ιερευς, signifying a sacrificing priest.

Mr. Pope.—What I said was, that it remains to be proved that the word ιερευς is employed in the New Testament, to designate a minister of the New Testament.

Mr. Maguire.—I beg to refer you to the fifth chapter of the Apocalypse of St. John. Here the Apostle describes a book which he saw lying at the right hand of him, who sat upon the throne, sealed with seven seals—he also saw a mighty angel who exclaimed with a loud voice—

"Who is worthy to open the book and to break the seals?"

And no person could be found either in heaven or on earth, or under the earth, to open the book, or look into it. The evangelist then proceeds to say that he wept much, because there was none found worthy, either to open the book, or to look at it. And one of the elders said to him—

"Weep not, behold the Lion of the tribe of Juda and the root of David, prevaileth to open the book and to break its seven seals."

In the 8th verse, he says—that when the Lion of the tribe of Juda, (meaning Christ) had opened the book, the four animals and the four and twenty elders prostrated themselves before the Lamb, saying—

"Thou art worthy, O Lord, to receive the book, and to break its seals, because thou hast been slain, and hast redeemed us unto God in thy blood, of every tribe, and tongue, and people, and nation, and thou hast made us a kingdom and priests and we will reign upon the earth."

I now wish it to be remarked, that the persons who are previously styled *Πρεσβυτεροι*,—Presbyters—are in the tenth verse styled *Ιερει*, translated by St. Jerome, *Sacerdotes*—the Vulgate translation of the tenth verse is—"Et fecisti nos Deo nostro regnum et *Sacerdotes;* et regnabimus super terram." Here the four and twenty elders, who are called in the fourth verse of the foregoing chapter, *Πρεσβυτεροι*, and who are said to have been clothed in white vestments, give glory to God that he had made them priests, as St. Jerome renders it, and that they will reign upon the earth. Now if these had not been priests of the new law how could they say, "we will reign upon the earth." But, as priests of the new law, the expression was reasonable, as they *had ruled* and are *still* ruling by their representative successors. It is admitted that *ιερευς* is applied to them, and I have shown that they must have been priests of the new law.

Mr. Pope laid much stress on the fact that our Lord spoke to his disciples at Capernaum in the Syriac language, and that, as there is no word in that language tantamount to "represent," the verb "*is*" is employed to convey the meaning of *represent.* I beg to remind my friend Mr. Pope, that he has fallen into a notable error on this point—he should have borne in his recollection, that although our Lord (who never wrote any) then *spoke in the Syriac tongue, the evangelist wrote his gospel in the Greek language*, which is not deficient in a word signifying "*to represent.*" Whatever question then may be raised relative to the language in which our Saviour spoke, his words have been transcribed into Greek, and I suppose Mr. Pope will not accuse the evangelists of *misrepresenting* Jesus Christ. Mr. Pope also formed an argument touching the ancient liturgies in the Syriac tongue. What is the fact? Every day in the year at St. Peter's in Rome, mass is celebrated in the Syriac, but the words of the

institution of the sacrament are retained in the original Greek—such was their great respect and awful veneration for the words of the institution.

I shall endeavour to follow Mr. Pope through the various observations in which he has indulged. I have taken my proofs from scripture and from the Fathers of the third, fourth, and fifth ages of the church. I have sustained no doctrine which I have not clearly proved to be founded on scripture. You will not fail to remark that Mr. Pope has appealed but to very few texts, and whether those which he has quoted, be equally strong and clear, and equally applicable as those adduced by me, I shall leave to you and to the world to decide. In the tenth chapter of St. John, verse 16, we read:

"And other sheep I have that are not of this fold: them also I must bring, and they shall hear my voice, and there shall be made *one fold and one shepherd.*"

It is plain that the idea of one fold signifies that all the sheep are to be kept under the control of one shepherd. Perhaps, this may not be the interpretation put upon the passage by Mr. Pope's private judgment, but it is in my opinion the clear and obvious meaning of the text. In the seventeenth chapter of John, verse 20, 21, our Saviour says:

"And not for them only do I pray, but for those also who through their word shall believe in me; that they may all be *one* as thou, Father, in me, and I in thee, that they also may be *one* in us; that the world may believe that thou hast sent me."

If the unity which Christ conferred upon his church be compared, as it here is, by Christ himself, to the unity which exists between him and his heavenly Father, it evidently follows that such unity can scarcely be exceeded. In Romans, xv, 5 and 6, we read,

"Now the God of patience and of comfort grant you to be of *one* mind, *one* towards another, according to Jesus Christ; that with *one* mind, and with *one* mouth, you may glorify God and the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ."

In the same chapter, verses 16 and 17, we read,

"Now I beseech you, brethren, to mark them *who cause dissensions*, and offend contrary to the doctrine which you have learned; and to avoid them."

In the 1st Corinthians, 1st chapter, 10th verse, we read,

"Now I beseech, you, brethren, that you all speak the *same* thing, and that there be no schisms among you; but that you be perfect in the *same* mind, and in the *same* judgments."

You will observe that the Apostle makes no distinction between schism in doctrine, and schisms in discipline.

"Careful to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace—*one* body and *one* spirit; as you are all called in *one* hope of your calling. *One* Lord, *one* faith, *one* baptism. *One* God, and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in us all."—Ephes. iv, 31, 5, 6.

Let us, therefore, as many as are perfect, be thus minded; nevertheless whereunto we are already arrived, that we be of the *same* mind; let us also continue in the *same* rule."—Phil. iii, 15, 16.

Mark the following words of the great Apostle of the Gentiles, in his epistle to Titus iii, 10—

"A man that is a heretic after the first and second admonition, avoid, knowing that he, that is such an one, is subverted and sinneth, being condemned by his *private judgment—proprio judicio condemnatus.*"

"But if any man seem to be *contentious*, we have no such custom, nor the church of God."—1 Cor. xi, 15.

Again,

"Follow peace with all men, without which no man shall see God."—Heb. xii, 14.

I have now laid before you direct and positive texts of scripture on the subject of unity, and I shall leave them for the present, without any commentary, to make the due impression upon the judgments of the candid and the impartial.

I shall now proceed to the testimonies of the Fathers on the subject. I shall commence at the earliest era, with Saints Ignatius and Clement; the latter was a disciple and coadjutor of the Apostles, as he is styled by St. Paul to the Phillippians (iv, 3.) Ignatius, whom I shall first quote, was the second bishop of Antioch, after St. Peter, and governed that church for forty years, and died a martyr, under the emperor Trajan. St. Ignatius, in his epistle to the people of Magnesia, having recommended them to preserve concord among themselves, and to submit to their superiors, as he does indeed in all his epistles, proceeds to say,

"Avoiding heterodox opinions and useless fables, labour to be strengthened in the doctrines of the Lord and of the Apostles, in order that you may prosper in all things, in body and spirit, in faith and charity; together with your respectable bishops, the united college of priests, and the holy deacons. *Be submissive to the bishops* and to one another, as Jesus Christ, according to the flesh, was to his Father, and the Apostles to Christ, and to the Father, and the Holy Spirit; that your union be in body and spirit."—*Ep. ad Magnes. inter P. P. Apost.* tome ii, p. 21. *Ed. Amstelædami*, 1724.

Again,

"I conjure you to use only Christian food, and to refrain from *foreign weed*, which is *heresy*. Guard yourselves from such, which you will do, if you be not puffed up, but remain inseparably united to Jesus Christ, and your bishop, and the ordinances of the Apostles. He who is *within* the altar is clean; but he who is *without*, that is *without the bishop*, and the priests, and the deacons, is not clean."—(*Ep. ad Trallianos*, p. 23.)

Again,

"He who corrupts the faith of God, for which Christ suffered, the same being defiled, shall go into unquenchable fire, as shall he that heareth him."—*Ep. ad Ephes.* p. 15.

"As children of light and truth avoid the divisions of unity, and the bad doctrines of heretics. Where the shepherd is, do you, like sheep follow."—*Ep. ad Philad.* p. 31.

St. Clement, the disciple of St. John the evangelist, and coadjutor of the Apostle Paul, in his first epistle to the Corinthians, chapter 46, (Inter P. P. Apostolicos, tome i, page 174, Edit. Amstelœdami, 1724,) has the following pertinent remarks:

"Why are these contentions and schisms among you? Have we not one God and one Christ? And one spirit and one calling in Christ? Why do we divide and sever the members of Christ, and raise sedition among the body? Your schisms pervert many; it has cast many into dejection; many it has caused to doubt, and afflicted us all. Notwithstanding this, you desist not."

St. Clement, you will also observe, makes no distinction whatever between schism in doctrine and in discipline, but bestows indiscriminate reprobation upon schism of every description.

Hegisippus, who was a native of Palestine, and belonged to the church of Jerusalem, and resided near twenty years at Rome and of whom St. Jerome says, that he lived near to the Apostolic times, and compiled a history in five books, of all that had passed from the death of our Lord to his own days, (a few frag. ments of which are preserved by Eusebius,) and who died about the year 180, has the following passages, as preserved by Eusebius in his History, (I shall give the words of the historian himself, as they are related of Hegisippus)—

"In the books which have come down to us, Hegisippus relates of himself, that as he went to Rome, he visited many bishops, and heard from all, one and the same doctrine. They called the church (says he) a virgin, because as yet she had not been corrupted by vain opinions. From the heretics who then rose, came false Christs, false prophets, and false Apostles; and these, introducing counterfeit doctrine against God, and against his Christ, severed the unity of the church."—Apud Euseb. Hist. Eccles. lib. iv, c. 22, p. 161. Ed. Cantabrig. 1720.

Irenæus,

"The church extended to the boundaries of the earth, received her faith from the Apostles, and their disciples. Having received it; she carefully retains it, as if dwelling in one house, as possessing one love, and one heart. the same faith she delivers and teaches with one accord, and as if gifted with one tongue. For though in the world there be various modes of speech, the tradition of doctrine is one and the same. In the churches of Germany, in those of Spain and Gaul, in those of the East, of Egypt, and of Africa, and in the middle regions, is the same belief—the same teaching. For as the world is enlightened by *one sun*, so does the preaching of one faith enlighten all men that are willing to come to the *knowledge of truth*. Nor among the pastors of the church does he that is eloquent deliver other doctrine, for no one is above his master—nor he that is weak in speech, diminish the truths of tradition. Faith being one, cannot be effected by the power or the want of utterance."—Adv. Heres. lib. i, c. ii, iii, p. 45, 46. Ed. Oxon. 1702.

And,

"God placed in his church, Apostles, prophets, doctors: and the whole operation of the spirit of which *they do not partake, who are not united to the church*; but by their own bad designs and actions, they deprive themselves of life. For where the church is, there is the Spirit of God; and where this Spirit is, there is the church and all grace; the Spirit is truth."—Ibidem. lib iii, c. 40, p. 266. See also Lib. iv, c. 62.

In the days of Irenæus commenced the *Quarto Deciman* dispute. The question regarded the time of celebrating the feast of Easter, and was finally decided against the churches of Asia Minor, by the council of Nice. This serious controversy extorted from the holy Father the pathetic and anxious language quoted above, by which he besought them to maintain not only unity in faith, but unity of discipline also. It further proves the solicitude of the church to maintain uniformity of practice.

Tertullian, De Prescrip. c. xx, p. 234.—

"The Apostles having received the promised assistance of the Holy Spirit first preached the faith in Judæa, and planted churches, whence, going into the whole world, they proclaimed the *same* doctrine to the nations, and founded churches. Therefore these, so many and so great churches, are *one* from that one of the Apostles, from which are all. And thus all are Apostolic, while all maintain the same unity."

And,

"There is one faith to the Apostles and to us—one God—one Christ—one hope—the same sacraments. Let me say it in one word, we are all one church. Whatever belongs to *any* among us, is also our own. Hoc nostrum est quodcumque nostrorum est."—De Virg. Veland, p. 309.

St. Clement of Alexandria, lib. vii, Stromat. No. 17, p. 899, 900—

"From what has been said, I think it manifest that there is only one true church, which is alone ancient, to which all the *just properly belong*. This church, which is one, is formed into one nature, which unity it is the endeavour of heretics to sever into many. Therefore we say, that the ancient and Catholic church alone is one in essence, in opinion, in origin, and in excellence, one in faith—Of this church, the eminence as well as the principle of its construction, arises from unity; by this surpassing all other things, and knowing nothing like or equal to itself. The doctrine of all the Apostles was one, as was one all that they delivered."

He elsewhere defines the church to be—

"A people collected into one faith from the Jews and Gentiles."

And afterwards adds—

"Thus they both arrive at the unity of faith."—Ibid. vi, p. 736, 793.

Hear the emphatic Origen—

"As they shall not possess the kingdom of God, who have been defiled by fornication, other impurities, and the worship of idols, so neither shall heretics." Hom. in ep. ad Tit. apud Pamphylum Apol. t. i, p. 481. Edit. Genebradi.

"Should any one be found not hastening, not betaking himself to the walled cities, that is, shall not have entered into the churches of God, but have remained without, he shall perish in the hands of the enemy."—Hom. v, in Jerem. t. iii, p. 161. Edit. Paris, 1733.

"Let no one persuade, no one deceive himself; out of this house, that is, out of the church, is no salvation. He that shall go out, becomes guilty of his own death."—Hom. iv, in Josue, t. ii, p. 404.

St Cyprian, the Martyr, who wrote an elaborate work, professedly upon the absolute necessity of Ecclesiastical Unity, as may be seen in his book, *passim*, De Unitate Ecclesiæ, p. 108 Edit. Oxon. 1682. et alibi- hus expresses himself:

"The church is one, widely extended by its fecundity; as there are many rays of light, but one sun; many branches of a tree, but one root deeply fixed; many streams of water, but one source. Take a ray from the sun; the unity of light allows not division. Break a branch from the tree, the branch cannot germinate. Cut off the stream from its source, the stream dries up. So the church sends forth her rays over the whole earth; yet is the light one, and its unity is undivided.

"He that does not hold this unity of the church, can he think that he holds the faith? He that opposes and withstands the church, can he trust that he is in the church? When the blessed Paul teaches the same thing, and shows the sacred character of unity, saying, (Ephes. iv, 4, 5, 6,) *one body* and *one spirit*, &c; which unity, it is our duty firmly to hold and to vindicate."

"Whosoever is separated from the church, is joined to an adulteress: is cut off from the promises of the church. Who deserts the church of Christ, obtains not the rewards of Christ. He is an alien; he is profane; he is an enemy. He cannot have God for a Father, who has not the church for his mother. If excluded from the ark of Noah, any one might have escaped; so may he, if out of the church. The Lord admonishes, and says, '*he that is not with me is against me.*"—(Mark, xii, 30.) Who violates the peace of Christ and concord, is against him."

"The Lord says, '*I and the Father are one,*' (John, x, 30.)—And again, of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, it is written, '*and these three are one,*' (John, i, 7.) He who holds not this unity, holds not the law of God, nor the faith of the Father and the Son, nor the truth that is unto salvation."—Ibid. p. 109.

And after proving that by the seamless garment of Christ the unity of the church was represented, the holy Martyr adds—

"Who is so wicked and perfidious, who so transported by the rage of discord, as to think, that the unity of God, the vesture of the Lord, the church of Christ may be severed? Christ tells us in his gospel, 'there *shall* be one *flock*, and one shepherd.'—(John, x, 16.) Does any one then imagine, that in the same place may be many shepherds and many flocks?

"The Apostle also, urging the same unity, entreats and admonishes, saying—'*Now I beseech you brethren*, by the name of the *Lord Jesus Christ, that you all speak the same thing, and that there be no schism among you.*'—Ibid. p. 110.

"God is one, and Christ is one, and his Church is one, and faith is one, and his people connected by one solid bond, is one. Unity cannot be severed nor the one body by laceration be divided. Whatever is separated from the stock cannot live; cannot breathe apart; it loses the substance of life."—Ibid. 119.

Dionysius of Alexandria, who was a catechist of the church of Alexandria, as St. Clement had been, and succeeded to that see about the year 247, and is much spoken of by the early ecclesiastical writers, as highly illustrious for the learning and zeal with which he defended the Catholic cause, and who died about the year 264, thus addresses the schismatic Novatian:

"You ought rather to have suffered all things than to have raised a schism in the church. To die in defence of its *unity* would be as glorious as laying down our life rather than sacrifice to idols; and in my opinion more glorious; because here the safety of the whole church is consulted. If you bring your brethren to union, this will overbalance your fault, which will be forgotten and you will receive commendation. If you cannot gain others, at least save your own souls."—Apud. Eusebii Hist. Eccles. lib. vi, c. 45, 318, Edit. Cantab. 1720.

Lactantius, who was called the Christian Cicero, in the 4th Book of his Institutions, c. xxx, p. 232, Cambridge Edition, 1685, has the following nervous language on the subject:

"The Catholic church alone retains the true worship. This is the source of truth, this is the dwelling of faith, this is the temple of God, into which he that enters not, and from which he that goes out, forfeits the hope of life, and of eternal salvation."

Alexander patriarch of Alexandria, who vigorously opposed the heresy of Arius from its very birth, and excommunicated its author and abettors, and who assisted at the first council of Nice, anno 325, writes to his "fellow-ministers of the Catholic church," as follows:

"As the body of the Catholic church is one, and the scriptures command, that we maintain the bond of peace and concord, it is proper, that in regard to all things that are done among us, we should condole or rejoice with one another."—Apud Socratem. lib. i, c. 6, p. 10. Edit. Cantab. 1720.

And speaking of the Arians, he says:

"That seamless garment which the murderers of Christ would not divide, these men (the Arians) have dared to rip asunder."—Apud Theodoret, Lib. i, c. 4, p. 9. Edit. Cantab. 1720.

The council of Nice, the first general council, held in the year 325, three hundred and eighteen bishops present—(as is generally admitted)—and held at a period too, when, by the confession of all Protestants, the church exhibited undoubted proofs of primitive purity, thus declared,

"But as to those persons who are found not to have declined to any schism, and to have kept themselves uncontaminated within the Catholic and Apostolic church, they have a right to ordain."—Gen. Con. t. ii, p. 250. Ed. Paris, 1671.

I have also Eusebius, Hist. Eccles. lib. v, c. 11, p. 212. Edit. Cant. 1720. St. Athanasius, whom the Protestants have borrowed from us, and adopted as their patron saint, and whose truth they so peremptorily insist upon, (I know not whether he be a favourite with the lay church of Mr. Pope,) thus expresses himself, in his epistle De Decret. Nicæn. t. i, p. 211:

"The Gentiles who disagree among themselves, are deprived of the true doctrine; but the saints, and they, who are the preachers of truth, are *unanimous*.—They lived, indeed, at different times, but the object of all was the same; for they were the propnets of one God, and they announced, with one consent, the same word of truth."

St. Basil,—

"We indeed, ourselves, are of little value; but, by the grace of God, we remain ever the same, unaffected by the common change of things. Our belief is not one at Seleucia, and another at Constantinople; one at Lampsachus, and another at Rome: and so different from what was in former times, but always one and the same."—*Ep.* 250 *ad Evæcinos*, t. iii, p. 386. Edit. Bened. Parisiis, 1721.

"As many as hope in Christ, are one people, and they, who are of Christ form one church, though it may be named in many places."—Ep. 161, *ad Amphil.* t. iii, p. 252.

Again—Ep. 204, *ad Neocæs.* t. iii, p. 307.

"It is more just to judge of our concerns, not from this or that man, who walk not in truth, but from the number of bishops who, in all regions, are united to us. Let the cities of Asia, the sound part of Egypt, and of Syria, be interrogated. These by letter communicate with us, and we with them. From these you may learn, that we are all unanimous; all think the same thing. Wherefore, he who declines our communion, may be considered by you, as separated from the universal church. It is better we should lose our lives, and that the churches should remain unanimous, than that on account of our childish feuds, the faithful should be so much injured.

St. Cyril of Jerusalem.

"Uphold the faith, and that faith alone, which is now delivered to thee *by the church*, confirmed as it is by all the scriptures."—Cat. v, No. 7, p. 75.

"We declare the ways of error, that we may proceed on one royal road."—Cat. xvi, No. 6, p. 226.

"As far as our time of instruction would allow, we have spoken to you of that holy and Apostolic faith which was delivered to you."—Cat. xviii. No. 7, p. 274.

Ephrem of Edessa,

"Blessed is the man, who has chosen the Catholic church. They shall be deemed deserving of punishment, who think of sowing the seeds of separation in the breast of men. Quit not then the Catholic faith, nor fall from it, should any question or schism arise."—*In Testam.* t. iii, p. 296. Edit. Bossii.

Again—*Sermo* 24, *adv. Herer*, p. 493, J. W. Bit. Quirini.

"The assembly of the good detest those appellations, which are derived from men; wherefore, the Sabellians and Arians, and sectaries, displeased with the names which their respective authors have given them, craftily endeavour to decorate themselves with the name of our church, and to please her. They are aware, who they are, whom she loves, and that she rests wholly on Christ. Have they not read how the Apostle blamed those, who said they were the followers of Paul, or of Apollos, or of Cephas? But a more bitter course of grief has assailed us, since some of our own standing have given their names to their followers. Blessed be that name wherein we were called. Consider, therefore, on which side is the doctrine of the Apostles. They gave no names; and where it is done, there is a departure from their rule. On the other hand we declare, that truth will be found with those, who are known by the name of Christ alone."

St. Ambrose, the meridian sun of the Latin church, commenting on the words of the apostles to the Ephesians, chap, iv, v. 4. "One body and one spirit, as you are called in one hope of your calling," says,

"To promote peace and concord, Paul added this—that as the church is one body, so the people should cultivate union; for the object of our belief is one, one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all."

Again, he commands unity, that,

"As all are called to unity, we should differ in nothing. For if there be one Lord, that is, one Christ; one faith and one baptism, one God and Father of all, the mind also should be one, and the heart of the people one, since all the things that he enumerates are examples of unity; for they agree in all things."—Comment in Cap. iv. Ep. ad Ephes. t. iii, p. 503. Ed. Paris, 1614.

On the death of his brother Satyrus, having related his escape from a storm, and the desire he felt to return solemn thanks to God, St. Ambrose adds:

"When we got to land, he sent for the bishop of the place; but aware that true faith alone was acceptable to heaven, he inquired of him was he in communion with the Catholic bishops, that is with the *Roman Bishops* (utrumnam cum Episcopis Catholicis, hoc est, cum Romana Ecclesia, Convenient?) For the country he knew was infected with schism. The bishop at the time had withdrawn himself from our communion: and though he was in banishment for his faith, yet in schism there could be no true faith. He had faith towards God, but not towards the church, whose members he permitted to be torn asunder. For since Christ died for the church, and the church is the body of Christ, they, by whom his passion is made void, and his body is torn asunder, cannot hold his faith. How desirous soever therefore my brother might be to express publicly his gratitude, he chose to defer it; because he knew that true faith was necessary for its due accomplishment."—De Obitu Fratris Satyri, t. iv, p. 316.

I have mentioned this one fact, because it shows more than any reasoning on the subject of union could do, how great was the horror then entertained of schism, or of departing from the faith or discipline of the church.

I have also Optatus, Jerome, Chrysostom, Augustin, Theodoret, the council of Chalcedon, &c, here, and they are all unanimous in their interpretation of the sacred Scriptures on this subject, and they are equally strong in holding the absolute necessity of unity in the church.

Mr. Pope.—Gentlemen, having spoken on the moral influence of that gospel, which proclaims acceptance to the guilty by faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, I shall not again return to the subject. I have been referred to the 5th chap. of the Apocalypse, in evidence that the word ιερευς is applied to the ministers of the New Testament. I reply, that the passage speaks of heaven, where the four-and-twenty elders are represented as singing to the praise of the Lamb: but it still remains for my friend to prove that the word ιερευς is applied to *the ministers of Christ on earth, so distinguish them from the laity.* I turn to the first chap. of the Apocalypse, and the 6th verse, and I read,

"Who hath made us a kingdom, and priests to God and his Father."

Here we find the Apostle, in reference to heaven, including laics, as well as ecclesiastics, in the general appellation of kings and priests. In the 1st of Peter, 2d ch. and 5th ver. believers on earth, *generally*, are called "βασιλειον ιερατευμα," "a royal priesthood;" it being evident from the opening verse of the epistle, that it is addressed not to ministers alone, or to the learned exclusively, but generally to the strangers scattered through the countries, of which the Apostle speaks. The expression ιερεις is, therefore, bestowed on the people of God at large, and is not

a peculiar designation of the ministers of the New Testament. My friend says, that Peter calls himself a priest. I turn to the passage referred to, 1st of Peter, 5th chapter, and 1st verse, and I find the expression is "συμπρεσβυτερος," "fellow-elder," not ιερευς. In the Douay version, I find that there also Peter in the passage is called, "an ancient," not a priest:

"The ancients, therefore, that are among you, I beseech, who am myself also an ancient, and a witness of the sufferings of Christ."

The term ιερευς is not even applied specially to the Apostles themselves. Mr. Maguire referred us to John: let him have the kindness to mention the passage to which he calls our attention, and you will be convinced that ιερευς is not the term employed.

[Mr. Maguire.—I spoke of Revelations 5th chapter, and 10th verse.]

Mr. Pope.—I was under the impression that you also referred to some other passage. But, to bring the point to an issue: I maintain, that the word ιερευς is not applied exclusively to the ministers of the New Testament, or even to the Apostles themselves. I here assert, that it is not so applied. Christ spoke in Syriac; and there being no word in the language signifying "to represent," he was obliged to employ the auxiliary verb. But the Apostle Paul wrote in Greek, which furnishes a word meaning "to represent;" yet he says, in 1st Cor. 10th chapter,

"That rock *was* Christ." "η πετρα ην ο Χριστος.

Again, he says, Galatians, 4th chap. and 24th verse,

"The one from Mount Sinai engendering into bondage, which is Agar." "οστις εστιν Αγαρ."

Here the auxiliary verb is employed as denoting to represent.

In the quotations made by Mr. Maguire throughout the discussion, he has taken it for granted, that the church of Rome is the church of Christ; but I appeal to your judgments, whether he has been able to prove the assumption. I admit that unity should exist amongst the disciples of Christ; but it should not be a mere external and superficial unity: it should be a union of affection and of doctrine in every essential point. This unity I have shown to exist in the Protestant churches. Let the creeds of the English, Scotch, Helvetic, and other Protestant communions, be examined. As to the passage, "one fold and one shepherd;" I hold, that the Saviour spoke of Jew and Gentile being joined together in one church. St. Paul says,

"He has broken down the middle wall of partition, and hath made of twain one new man."—Ephes. ii, 14, 15.

When the Saviour prays that they all might be one, he speaks I admit, of his church: but does Mr. Maguire mean to say

that the Pope is *the* shepherd I have shown that the Pope is incompetent to discharge the duties of the office. Christ is that shepherd, as the Apostle Peter says, who calls him

"The shepherd and bishop of the soul."—1 Pet. ii, 25.

Mr. Maguire refers us to the words of the Saviour's prayer for his disciples,

"That they may be one, as thou Father art in me, and I in thee."

Now I would ask, is the union existing between the Father and the Son a sensible, a tangible, a visible union? Is it not evidently spiritual in its character? A spiritual bond does subsist amongst the people of God in the Protestant communions. The supplication of our Lord and of Paul, that they may be of "the same mind," will be more and more fulfilled in the real and spiritual union of the people of God. I trust, we shall see them in heart and hand still more cordially united together, evidencing that there does exist amongst them a kindred spiritual affection, "where there is neither Jew, nor Greek, Barbarian, Scythian, bond nor free, but Christ is all in all."—Coloss. iii, 11. These holy bonds will never be dissolved: they survive the stroke of death—they exist throughout eternity; and as the ages of immortality shall roll along, will they be more and more consolidated, and more closely linked together. My friend quotes Romans, xvi, 17.

"Now I beseech you, brethren, to mark them who make dissensions and offences, contrary to the doctrine which you have learned, and to avoid them."

Mark, it is *doctrine* of which he speaks—now it is in exact compliance with this command, that we separate from the church of Rome; because she errs in doctrine, and teaches the inventions of men, instead of the commandments of God. Perhaps Mr. Maguire would like to hear a quotation from Augustin, in illustration of this observation. Many gave up the scriptures in the time of persecution, and were in consequence called Traditors. It was urged on St. Augustin to leave the communion of the Traditors. St, Augustin then replies,

"Is it that the Traditors have instituted some new sacraments, or some new baptism? Is it that they have composed books to teach others to do or imitate the action of the Traditors, or that they have recommended those books to posterity, or that we hold and follow that doctrine? If they had done so, and suffered no person to have been in their communion, but those who would read their books and approve that doctrine, I say, that they would have separated themselves from the unity of the church: and if you saw me in their schism, you would then have reason to say, that I were in the church of the Traditors."—Augustin Contr. Crescon. lib. iii, cap. 38.

Now the Church of Rome has introduced new sacraments and uncanonical books, which she has recommended to posterity as divine. She suffers none in her communion who do not hold

her peculiar opinions, and therefore separates herself from the unity of the church: and consequently, according to St. Augustin, they who are in the church of Rome, are in the church of the schismatics.

Mr. Maguire has asked, as it respects unity, what difference is there between discipline and doctrine? Mr. Maguire himself told us, that while in essential matters the members of the church of Rome agreed, they do not accord in matters of discipline—and that men are at liberty to exercise their judgments upon the notes attached to the Douay Bible.

As to the passage relative to keeping the unity of the spirit, you plainly perceive that it speaks of a spiritual unity.

"Careful to keep the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace, one body and one spirit, as you are called in one hope of your calling, one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in us all."—Eph. iv, 3, 6.

The passage clearly refers, not to unity founded on non-essential points, but to unity founded on the great leading truths of Christianity. In the Protestant authorized confessions of faith, we can see that there exists an accordance on the fundamental principles of revelation.

Again, Mr. Maguire quoted from Philippians,

"Let us also continue in the same rule."

But I beg your attention to the preceding verse,—

"If in any thing you be otherwise minded, this also God will reveal to you."—iii, 16.

This passage shows, that at that time some differences of opinion probably existed amongst them, and that the Apostles did not excommunicate them for entertaining those differences; but assured them at the same time that God would reveal to them the truth on the particular points concerning which differences existed. Mr. Maguire has also quoted,

"If any be contentious we have no such custom."—1 Cor. xi, 16.

Mr. Maguire and J. K. L. appear to have fallen into a similar misapprehension of the meaning of this passage.—"No such custom," refers not to contentions, but to women sitting with the head uncovered in the assemblies of the saints. I find that certain differences existed and were allowed, even in the church at Rome. We read that one man believed that he might eat all things, another that he should eat herbs.—(Rom. xiv, 2.)—that one man esteemed one day above another, while another esteemed every day alike.—(5th v.) But what says the Apostle?

"Let every man be fully persuaded *in his own* mind."—(5th v.)

Or as the Douay version has it—

"Let every man abound in his own sense."

Mr. Maguire has informed us, that the primitive church cast out heretics. Every Protestant church, also, has a right to exclude from its communion, if it pleases. I admit that the Fathers spoke of one church; but that one church was the mystical body of Christ, not confined to one external communion, portions of it belonging to the various Christian congregations. My friend has referred us to the passage of Cyprian, "he has not God for his Father, who has not the church for his mother," and has twice quoted it. Now I say, that Cyprian, in a letter in which he reprehends Pope Stephen, once employed that passage in reference to Stephen himself, because he introduced divisions into the church.

Mr. Maguire observes, that the church was not confined to the diocess of Rome; that the Catholic church in primitive times was not the church of Rome—this is precisely the same language which he employed before. St. Firmilian, addressing Pope Stephen says:

"Do not deceive yourself; *you have cut yourself off from the church;* for he is truly a schismatic who has made himself an apostate from the communion of ecclesiastical unity: for while you think you can excommunicate all other churches from you, you have only excommunicated yourself from them." Cyp. Ep. 75, p. 228,—Edit. Oxon.

St. Gregory the Great remarks:

"If the church come to depend upon one, it must certainly fall."

And St. Cyprian says:

"That therefore Christ made the college of bishops numerous, that if one should fall or turn heretical, the rest might interfere for the saving of the flock."

For he says:

"There is but one flock, and one episcopate, of which every bishop has the whole in partnership with the rest."

"Episcopatus unus est, cujus a singulis in solidum pars tenetur."

The historian Socrates, who carried on Eusebius's Ecclesiastical History from the year 329, to the year 440, informs us, that a great diversity existed among the different churches in respect to ceremonies and discipline, *especially with respect to the marriage of persons in holy orders.* He remarks, that the Apostle did not give any directions about holy days, their only design being to teach faith and virtue. He also says, that there were scarcely two churches which exactly agreed on the subject of prayers; and concludes by observing, that to give a catalogue of all the rites and customs in use among Christians in all cities and countries, would be very difficult, if not impossible.—(L. v, c. 22.) St. Irenæus notices, in terms rather of commendation than censure, the diversity of fasts among his contemporary brethren.—Ap. Euseb, l, v, c. 22. Polycarp, bishop of Smyrna,

and Anicetus, Bishop of Rome, held irreconcilably opposite opinions respecting the time of celebrating Easter; yet they did not violate Christian unity, as their less worthy successors have done on the same custom—the latter, as Eusebius states having permitted the former to administer the eucharist in his church. With regard to the re-baptizing those who had been baptized by heretics, the church of Africa, adopting the immemorial usage of the ancient churches of Cappadocia, Cilicia and Galatia, differed from that of Rome; yet this difference occasioned no schism between them. St. Cyprian, some will be surprised to learn, held washing the feet to be a sacrament: and St. Augustin differed from St. Jerome, respecting the introduction of Jewish rites and usages into the Christian church; but they did not depart from Christian charity. From the writings of St. Irenæus, St. Firmilian, and Justin Martyr, we learn, that they who required conformity in matters, not evidently fundamental on scriptural grounds, were regarded as violators of Christian unity.—(Iren. Ap. Euseb. l. v, c. 24. Firm. Ap. Cyp. ep. 75, J. Mart. Dial. cum Tryph.)

Hear the sentiment laid down in the Maynooth class book, p. 17:

"Schismatics, even those who should not err in doctrine, by the act of schism alone are excluded from the church, and are without the way o salvation."

Or in other words, those, however correct their doctrines, who separate from the church of Rome, are excluded from the church of Christ, and are without the way of salvation! I assert that the unity subsisting in the church of Rome is a unity without examination. Since the commencement of the discussion, I received a letter from London, as did Mr. Maguire also (for the letter to me states that a duplicate was sent to Mr. Maguire.) It is signed "An Inquirer after Truth." The writer remarks, that before the discussions took place in Ireland, his mind was not troubled with doubts—but that since these were held, he has been reading the scriptures under the direction of the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Dublin, and finds many difficulties raised in his mind in reference to the sacred volume. The unity of the church of Rome is, in truth, a unity that will not bear the test of examination.

We have heard of the faith of the collier commended by Cardinal Bellarmine. The collier, when asked what it was he believed, answered: "I believe what the church believes." The other rejoined—"What then does the church believe?" He replied readily—"The church believes what I believe." The other anxious to bring him to the point, once more resumed his inquiry: "Tell me then, I pray you, what it is which you

and the church believe?" The only answer the comer could give, was—"Why, truly, Sir, the church and I, both believe the same thing."—*See Bellarmine de arte bene moriendi*, lib. ii, ch. 9.

Hear a schoolman. Gabriel Byel maintains that,

"If he who implicitly believes the church, should think, misled by natural reason, that the Father is greater than the Son, and existed before him, or that the three Persons are things locally distant from one another, or the like, he is not a heretic, nor sins, provided he do not defend this error pertinaciously, for he believes what he does believe, because he thinks that the church believes so, subjecting his opinion to the faith of the church. For though his opinion be erroneous, his opinion is not his faith, nay his faith in contradiction to his opinions, is the faith of the church. What is still more, this implicit faith not only defends from heresy and sin, but even constitutes merit in heterodoxy itself, and preserves in that merit one who forms a most heterodox opinion, because he thinks the church believes so."—*Dr. Campbell's Lectures on Eccl. His.* vol. ii, p. 259.

Mr. MAGUIRE.—With respect to the 5th chapter of St. John I do assert, and I beg the public to bear it in mind, that the expression ιερευς is applied to the twenty-four who sat around the throne, and were called neither more nor less than Presbyters. I am satisfied to let the passage be examined by any learned man; I here offer to submit the question to the adjudication of any two individuals.—Let Mr. Pope select one and I shall select another, and then let them examine the context. Mr. Pope has recurred to the quibble about the difference between the church of Rome and the Catholic church. I appeal to yourselves if I have not quoted upwards of twenty Fathers in refutation of the idle argument which Mr. Pope endeavours to construct on this matter. Have I not amply shown that the term "Catholic," was applied to all the churches in Asia, in Africa, in Spain, in Gaul, &c, &c, *holding communion with the See of Rome?* I have proved that the holy Fathers all agreed in this interpretation of the words "Catholic church." It is a mere play upon words with which my opponent has amused you. I have laid before you abundant evidence that before the Reformation, there existed no other church which claimed to itself the title of "Catholic," but the church of Rome. With regard to the doctrine which Mr. Pope has broached, on the subject of unity, I will only say, that all sects in the world are in the spirit of union, according to Mr. Pope. But our Saviour has compared the unity of his church to the union subsisting between him and his heavenly Father; therefore, that union must be of a most intimate nature, and the church must endeavour to imitate the wonderful union existing between God the Father, and God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost. With regard to the differences of which Mr. Pope spoke, as existing in the Catholic church, they involve not principles, and that is a sufficient answer

to his very silly objection relative to the Dominicans, the Franciscans, and the Jesuits. Mr. Pope has also introduced the Jansenists—they were long since condemned by the Catholic church in the bull Unigenitus. As to St. Ambrose, I have already quoted at length his opinions on the necessity of unity. With respect to texts of scripture, I fearlessly appeal to every gentleman who hears me, whether I have not brought forward more texts of scripture than Mr. Pope—whether my texts have not been clearly and decisively in support of the doctrine which I maintain—and whether Mr. Pope has not offered violence to the meaning of scripture, by the strange and far-fetched interpretations which he has sought to impose upon this learned assembly? I ask any candid man here, whether Mr. Pope's explanations of some texts have not been more difficult and abstruse than the texts themselves? If such be not the fact, I know nothing of scripture. What right has Mr. Pope to set up his private judgment in preference to the opinions of the Apostles who were inspired? He quoted the royal prophet as to the eastern kings who had combined against God; and he introduced this as an argument against the existence of unity in the Catholic church! Was here a church established then? If there were, he must then, to sustain his arguments, prove that it was lawful for the eastern kings to divide themselves from that church, and to become schismatics.

If there were not a church government then existing, his argument falls to the ground. I have laid before you this day, plain and obvious texts of scripture, regarding the necessity of unity in the church of Christ. The doctrine which I advocate, I have shown to be distinctly founded upon scripture. I have defied Mr. Pope to show, that in regard to unity, there is any distinction made between essentials and non-essentials in scripture. The texts which have been quoted equally refer to matters of discipline, and of doctrine. If men will not be united—if divisions, no matter how they originate, will exist; if people become split into sects and parties, and endeavour to tear their common parent asunder, surely the evil is not to be laid at the door of the Catholic church. She is not to be held accountable for those of her children who may disobey her—who violate charity, and disturb that peace which our Lord bequeathed to his church—

"My peace I leave you—my peace I give you; not as the world giveth do I give you."

No plea—no pretext can ever justify a departure from that Christian harmony, of which our Saviour set an example, the necessity of which we find recommended from his sacred lips, and which he bequeathed to his church, to be observed and

maintained without condition or alteration, unto the end of the world—

"My peace I leave you—my peace I give you; not as the world giveth do give you."—John, xiv, 27.

Mr. Pope quotes the holy Fathers; it is rather extraordinary indeed, that the Fathers should be quoted to show that unity in the church is not necessary. They affirm that there is no having the inheritance of Peter without the faith of Peter. So I believe. There can be no inheritance possessed without faith; and there can be no real faith, according to scripture, where there is not charity and Christian union. I have proved that the unity which is commanded by our Saviour, which was preached by the Apostles, and which was taught by their disciples in the first ages of Christianity, exists alone in the Catholic church. Mr Pope says that the unity which exists among Protestants is sufficient. I call upon him to prove his position upon the authority of the word of God. He has quoted the church of Rome with regard to councils, &c, to show that she had not unity. But since the Reformation, it is admitted by Protestants, that they have no such unity. The illustrious Grotius lamented the schisms which existed among Protestants in his days; and he said it would be almost better to return to Popery than to remain divided as they were. Luther himself threatened to return to Popery if their divisions increased. When he saw Calvin denying openly the real presence of Christ in the eucharist, he lamented that he had ever quitted Popery.

With regard to councils, the assertions of Mr. Pope are mere assumptions, and it is a well known rule in logic, that 'quod gratis asseritur, gratis negari debet.' I again challenge Mr. Pope to show from scripture the distinction between essentials and non-essentials. I call upon him to prove that there is a distinction drawn in scripture between doctrine and discipline. He must prove that there is a difference upon an article of faith or that there exists a distinct breach of communion in the Catholic church, in order to establish his position, that she does not possess unity. Differences as to private opinions amongst private individuals he may prove, but these individuals did not disturb that peace, and concord, and unity, which Christ left to his church, and which form some of the noblest marks—the most powerful arguments of her divine origin.

He may show the existence of differences, not relating to matters of faith or discipline in the church, but they are not differences of opinion which place those who entertain them out of the church. He may prove the existence of such differences, but a breach of communion he cannot establish. He asks for proofs that Peter was appointed the head of the church. I think

I have furnished ample proofs of the fact. He asserts that it is robbing Christ of his rights. This is a mere play upon words. There is no doubt that Christ in heaven is the sole and invisible head of the church—but knowing the frailties of man, our Lord deemed it necessary, in order to preserve the principle of unity, to appoint a visible head of his church to act as his instrument and agent upon earth. Is there ought in this derogatory from the majesty of God? Is not the king the visible head of the established church of England? His majesty, no doubt, will be highly pleased with Mr. Pope for denying his spiritual superiority. I always imagined that his majesty was the head of the Protestant church in these countries—the centre and bond of connection to keep it together. He is to preserve the homilies and the thirty-nine articles, and not to allow even *the slightest* deviation to be made from them. They contain certain rules respecting faith and discipline in the Protestant church, and the king is bound by oath not to suffer the slightest deviation from them. The king swears to support the establishment, and the test act excludes all from situations unless they take oaths which bind as to certain forms and rules of faith. The elements of union have been scattered in the Protestant churches, and they can never again be brought into combination. I should be glad to know from Mr. Pope, what did our Saviour mean when he said to Peter:

"Simon Barjona, lovest thou me more than these; he saith to him, dear Lord, thou knowest that I love thee. He saith to him, Feed my Lambs," John, xxi, 17.

Our Saviour repeated the interrogatory; Peter made a similar reply, and our Saviour again said; "Feed my Lambs." But when he repeated the question a third time, Peter became troubled, and exclaimed; "Lord thou knowest all things—Thou knowest that I love thee." Our Saviour then said to him: "Feed my sheep."

Now, I defy the ingenuity of my friend to explain away these words. This address was not made to the other Apostles, but personally and individually to Peter. There is nothing in the fold of Christ but sheep and lambs (clergy and laity); over them Peter was appointed supreme pastor, and invested with the authority of government. Our Lord afterwards says to Peter:

"I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt bind upon earth, it shall be bound also in heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt loose upon earth, it shall be loosed also in heaven."

Could Mr. Pope quote any text of scripture against me equally as plain and obvious as the foregoing? Was he able to adduce any direct text in support of his private interpretation—while on the other hand I proved all my doctrines by manifest texts of

scripture, and upon the words of Christ and his Apostles. Mr. Pope endeavours to show that Peter could not be the successor of Christ, as this evil would follow that the successor of Peter would be a greater man than St. John the evangelist, who lived after the death of Peter. To such straights has my opponent been reduced. He cannot deny that Peter had a successor. Why not prove that some difference on matters of faith arose between him and St. John? But the successors of Peter were blessed with humility, charity, and divine faith—the first thirty-four of them suffered martydom. If they had happened to have a difference, they would have recurred to St. John for his advice and guidance—but that would not be denying their right to succeed Peter, as the visible head of the church on earth.

"If I then," said our Saviour, "being Lord and Master, have washed your feet, you also ought to wash one another's feet."

That act, I affirm, with the Catholic church, to be an act of humility, not a precept—but it is, to all appearance, a positive precept, and I repeatedly called on my friend to show by what authority he neglected to observe it. He drew a distinction indeed between hot and cold climates, and the greater necessity which exists for washing the feet in the former than in the latter. But no such distinction is drawn in the text—the commandment of the Saviour is not to be regulated by hot and cold countries. He talks of the council of Jerusalem, and of Peter having spoken first—if Peter had spoken last what would that be to the argument? St. James gave a good advice, which was inspired by the Holy Ghost, and because it was adopted by Peter, therefore Peter could not be the head of the Church! This conclusion is certainly not agreeable to the premises—He says that no Pope claimed the title of ecumenical pastor until the year 600—why there was no such word as ecumenical in existence till that period. The word 'consubstantiality' is not in scripture, and does not occur till 300 years after the Apostles, when we find it in the Athanasian creed, and the decrees of the council of Nice. If Mr. Pope's argument then on this head be valid against the supremacy of the Pope, it is equally valid against the Athanasian creed, and he should deny both. I admit the act of Stephen throwing the body of the Pope into the Tyber, and the greater scoundrel he was, I affirm, for so doing. I admit there were some bad characters among the Popes. But I have already drawn a distinction between infallibility and impeccability. Besides, I never said that the infallibility of the Pope formed a portion of my creed. Christ promised his church that she would never fail in the faith, but that promise never implied, that her children should be incapable of sin. As I have already told you, there were eleven monstrous bad Popes

out of nearly three hundred good and virtuous characters which adorned the chair of Peter. Surely that is a vast majority to counterbalance the few bad names. Honorius was not a heretic. It was not for heresy that he was deposed, but because he had been put into the chair by temporal power. He was suspected of being favourable to the Monotholites; but I deny that it was ever proved that he was a Monotholite himself. I venture to affirm, that Mr. Pope will be called to an account for having denied the king's supremacy; and it will be necessary, perhaps, for some of his friends to intercede for him with his majesty, lest, like Chancellor Moore and Bishop Fisher, he be, without further ceremony, committed to the tower. In that case he may, for once, have to acknowledge the efficacy of the *intercession of saints*. I maintain, that ιερευς is applied in the New Testament to the Apostles. But whether it be, or not, does not much matter for the argument. There is no sacrificing priest in the strict sense of the term, but Christ himself, who is at once the priest and victim, who is offered up as a perpetual sacrifice to fulfill the prophecy of Malachy, that in all parts of the world a sacrifice shall be offered to the Lord.

"For from the rising of the sun to the going down of the same, my name is great among the Gentiles; and in every place a sacrifice is made, and a clean oblation offered to my name; because my name is great among the Gentiles, saith the Lord of Hosts."

If there had been only a single sacrifice offered up in Jerusalem, according to Mr. Pope, then this prophecy of Malachy would not have been fulfilled. Mr. Pope has, by weak and idle arguments, endeavoured to show that there could have been no successor to Christ. If Christ left a sacrifice and appointed a successor in his church, neither blasphemy nor wickedness can be imputed to those who believe the fact.—Christ promised that his church would never fail, and that he would remain with her in spirit, till the consummation of ages. But Mr. Pope, to sustain his argument, must prove that the whole church was for the space of 900 years buried in darkness and error. Let those who will, believe it—I want not to make the Pope greater than other men. He is, like myself, a man, liable to the frailties of human nature. The infallibility of the Pope is no doctrine of mine.

Mr. Pope says, that he does not differ on essentials with the church of England, and yet he denies more than one half of her articles of faith. Either he holds them essential or he does not. In the latter case his separation is unjustifiable, and he evidently shows that he misunderstands the maxims of the gospel: he rends the seamless garment of Christ without cause. He should not for trifling reasons disturb that harmony which Christ ordained should subsist between the members of his church—he should

continue to hold communion with the bishops of the established church, and not set up a conventicle of his own. He should not break communion *ne in minima particula.* The holy Fathers held schism and disunion to be mortal sins. Mr. Pope spoke of a letter which he had received from London, and which he would have us suppose came from a reformed Catholic, another Blanco White. But *latet anguis in herba.* I got a copy of the same too. I suspect that it came from the opposite party, and was intended to frighten me from this discussion. It was probably a *ruse* employed to make me retreat, that my friend then, instead of suffering a defeat, might raise the shout of victory.

Mr. Pope.—As to the word ιερευς in the 5th of the apocalypse, the term in that passage is clearly bestowed upon presbyters in heaven. My friend has appealed to any learned men on the subject. He may prefer an ecclesiastic; I therefore nominate Mr. Singer; let Mr. Maguire name his referee. [*Mr. Clynch was then named by Mr. Maguire,*] Mr. Maguire has not answered my quotation from the Psalms, on the ground in which I made it. I brought it forward merely as evidence, that unity, abstractedly considered, is not a proof of the true church. As to the distinction of essentials and non-essentials, I have shown that it was recognized by St. Paul, in the differences which existed in the church of Rome in his day, and which he allowed to continue. The scriptures, therefore, does make this distinction. The sacred volume, Mr. Maguire asserts, requires an agreement in discipline as well as in matters of faith; and yet he before informed us that the church of Rome agrees, not in matters of discipline, but in matters of faith, and has therefore contradicted himself. I have already entered into the question of the apocryphal books, and shall not now reconsider it. According to Mr. Maguire, the church has *two* heads—Christ and the Pope: so it appears that Mr. Maguire thereby makes the church of Christ a monster. He refers me to the Saviour's address to Peter, "Feed my sheep."—Augustine, (De Agone Christ. c. 30) and Ambrose, (De Dign. Sacred. p. 336) as I have already shown, declare it as their opinion, that Christ gave this privilege not to Peter only, but to all pastors. As Peter had denied the Saviour, our Lord saw it necessary to re-instate him in the apostolic office; thrice did he address him in doing so, in reference to his threefold denial. Here observe that Irenæus informs us, that Peter was not the only founder of the church of Rome, but Paul also:

"Fundantes igitur et instuentes beati apostoli (Petrus et Paulus,) ecclesiam (Romanan) Lino episcopatum administrandæ ecclesiæ tradiderunt. Succedit autemei Anacletus. Post eum tertio loco ab apostolis episcopatum sortitur Clemens."

"The blessed Apostles, therefore, (Peter and Paul,) founding and arranging the (Roman) church, delivered the episcopate for governing the church to Linus. But Anacletus succeeds to him: after him, in the third place, from the *apostles*, Clement obtains the episcopate."

My friend has said, if Christ appointed the Popes as supreme, the exercise of their office would not be an assumption—but the appointment is the very matter at issue. We have no ground either from reason or scripture to prove, that the Pope should be regarded as supreme bishop. As to the supremacy of Peter: if Peter was bishop of Rome, is it not remarkable, that Paul, in writing to the church of Rome, should not mention the name of Peter? and after Paul had gone to that city, is it not strange that he should make no mention of Peter in his epistles written from that city to several churches. In the 4th of Colossians, 10th and 11th verse, he says, that only Aristachus, and Mark, and Justus, were his helpers in the kingdom of God: if Peter had been at Rome, would he not mention him as a fellow-helper? On his trial all fled,—(2 Timothy, iv, 16.) Are we to suppose that Peter forsook him in the hour of his extremity. If Peter were really the bishop of Rome, I think you will agree with me, that he was at least non-resident. I am told by Mr. Maguire that there were at least eleven bad Popes. This is a great acknowledgment. Genebrard, a Roman Catholic writer, however, informs us, that

"Per annos ferè 150, Pontifice circiter 50, a Jonanne scilicet octavo usque ad Leonem IX, a virtute majorem prorsus defecerunt, apostatici potius quam apostolici." "*For nearly 150 years, about fifty Popes, namely, from John the 8th to Leo the 9th, revolted altogether from the virtue of their predecessors, being rather apostate than apostolic.*"

So that we have about 50 bad Popes instead of 11. A proof that Pope Honorius was a Monotholite heretic, shall appear in the printed report.*

My friend has admitted. THAT THERE IS NO SUCH OFFICER IN THE CHURCH OF CHRIST AS A SACRIFICING PRIEST. Mr. Maguire has quoted a passage from the book of Malachy. I hold that the oblation there spoken of, is the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, and spiritual service: the repitition of the sacrifice of Christ would imply, that the sacrifice on Calvary was insufficient.

*The following passage from Dupin, a Roman Catholic historian, is given in proof of the above statement:

"The Roman church has so plainly acknowledged that Pope Honorius did advance the error of the Monotholites, that, in the ancient breviary, she declares that he was condemned with the other Monotholites, for maintaining the doctrine of one will

* * * * * * * * *

It is more just and rational, to give credit to the one general council, where matters are examined to the bottom, than to sentiments of some private men, who judge of this fact according to their own interest or prejudices. This will stand for certain, then, that Honorius was condemned, and justly too, as an heretic by the 6th council."—Dupin's Eccles. Hist. vol. ii, page 16, 3d edition, Dublin, 1723.

"I beseech you by the mercies of God, (saith the apostle) that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy and acceptable unto God, which is your reasonable service."—(Rom. xii. 1.)

I called your attention to a letter which had received. It is strange that the same idea should have occurred to my mind, relative to the writer. I imagined, that it came from a friend of Mr. Maguire's. I here solemnly declare, that I know not the author, or any thing whatever of the matter, save, that the letter came through the post-office to me. I will now show you that divisions have existed in the church of Rome. The Franciscans held the immaculate conception of the Virgin Mary, the Dominicans denied it. We read of the battles between the Dominicans and Jesuits in two popedoms—the Dominicans urging the doctrine of unconditional degrees. The Jesuits and Jansenists maintained a warfare from 1642 to 1705. As the members of the church at Corinth were censured by the Apostles for saying, "I am of Paul, and I of Apollos, and I of Cephas;" how can these parties escape a similar censure, by their preference for one person as their peculiar general—one saying I am of Benedict—another, I am of Francis—and another, I am of Dominick. In the controversy between the Jesuits and Jansenists, there appeared from the press, the "Torch of St. Augustin," "Snuffers for St. Augustin's Torch," and lastly, "A Gag for the Jansenists." Soon after the Bull Unigenitus was issued and by this document the purest part of the church of Rome was put down—witness the demolition of Port Royal.

"The Bull Unigenitus," says that most learned Roman Catholic, Doctor O'Connor, "was condemned by the Sorbonne immediately after the death of Louis; and the Jesuit Le Tellier, the Monarch's confessor, was banished to La Fleche, loaded with public execration. The condemnation of the ninety-first proposition, *by its enforcing obedience to unjust censures, was felt to be repugnant to moral obligations.* The refusal of the sacraments to those who would not subscribe the bull, disturbed the tranquillity of private life, and caused an insurrection of the magistracy, so that those who persisted in the refusal, were banished the kingdom. Benedict the fourteenth, fearful of the storm which thickened every day, issued a brief, declaring that, since he could not condemn the bulls of his predecessors, the bull should be registered, but that those who rejected it, ought to have the sacraments at their own risk.

I wonder, under such circumstances, what priest would have administered the sacraments?

"This political middle course was called *the law of silence*, and caused the greatest scandal of all. The Parliaments, disgusted rather than edified by this political middle course in matters of religion, protested against it, and utterly suppressed the bull, as repugnant to the liberties of the Gallican Church."—Columbanus, 6, xx.

My friend has told us, that the Jesuits and Jansenists, the Franciscans and Dominicans, never broke the bond of Christian charity. It is notorious that the Jesuits, and the secular c

parish priests, are not on the most amicable terms, the latter being jealous of their interference. We shall see how they acted. Parsons, the Jesuit, writing against the secular priests, thus describes them:—

"They be mad heads, seditious libellers, notorious caluminators, factious, turbulent, of scandalous lives, writing egregious, malicious untruths; impudent, factious, wicked slanderers; they are rebels to, and betrayers of the Catholic cause."—*Parson's Apologue*, chap. iv, p. 8.

On the other side, the Seculars called the Jesuits "Schismatics, Donatists, Arians; who make religion a mere political Atheistical device." And Watson calls Parsons

"An Atheal strategemitor (page 160, Quodlibets;) a bastardly vicar of hell; a judge paramount on earth under the devil; a Wolsey in ambition, Midas in immundicity, a traitor in action."

And again, he says of all the Jesuits in England, that

"They surfeited sorer than Heliogabalus; that they were taught by their Arch-Rabbis to maintain (with their equivocations) dissimulation, detraction, sedition; that they were busied in making strife between kings and kings, states and states, priests and priests, raising rebellions, murdering princes, stirring uproars every where; men unworthy to be called religious or Catholic, or Christian; for, however they may boast of their perfection, their holiness, their meditation, and their exercises, yet their plots are heathenish and satanical, fit to set Machiavel, Lucian; yea, Don Lucifer himself to school. Wretched Jesuits, who would have all Catholics depend on the arch-priest, when the arch-priest depended on John Garnet, Garnet upon Parsons, and Parsons on the devil."

Mr. Maguire says, that there is no sacrificing priest; and yesterday, in accordance with the doctrine of his church, he observed, that the sacrifice of the Eucharist is offered in an unbloody manner. I beg to remind him that the Bible says, "WITHOUT SHEDDING OF BLOOD THERE IS NO REMISSION." (Heb. ix, 22.) With respect to transubstantiation, I beg to read you an extract from Gage's Survey of the West Indies. Lon. 1655, page 197; formerly a priest of the church of Rome.

"One day, saying mass in the chief church, after the consecration of the bread, being with my eyes shut at that mental prayer, which the church of Rome calleth the Memento for their dead, there came from behind the altar a mouse, which running about, came to the very bread or wafer-god of the Papists, and taking it in his mouth ran away with it; not being perceived by any of the people who were at mass, for that the altar was high by reason of the steps going up to it, and the people far beneath. But as soon as I opened my eyes to go on with my mass, and perceived my God stolen away, I looked about the altar and saw the mouse running away with it; which on a sudden did so stupify me, that I knew not well what to do or say; and calling my wits together, I thought that if I should take no notice of the mischance, and any body else in the church should, I might justly be questioned by the Inquisition; but if I should call on the people to look for the sacrament, then I might be but chid and rebuked for my carelessness, which, of the two, I thought would be more easily borne than the rigour of the Inquisition.—Whereupon, not knowing what the people had seen, I turned myself unto them, and called them unto the altar, and told them plainly, that whilst I was

in my *memento* prayers and meditations, a mouse had carried away the sacrament; and that I knew not what to do, unless they would help me to find it out again. The people called a priest that was at hand, who presently brought in more of his coat; and, as if their God by this had been eaten up, they presently prepared to find out the thief, as if they would eat up the mouse that had so assaulted and abused their God. They lighted candles and torches to find out the malefactor in his secret and hidden places of the wall, and after much searching and enquiry for the sacrilegious beast, they found at last in a hole of the wall, the sacrament, half eaten up, which, with great joy, they took out; and, as if the ark had been brought again from the Philistines to the Israelites, so they rejoiced for their new-found God, whom, with many people now resorted to the church, with many lights of candles and torches, with joyful and solemn music they carried about the church in procession. Myself was present upon my knees, shaking and quivering for what might be done unto me, and expecting my doom and judgment; and as the sacrament passed by me, I observed in it the marks and signs of the teeth of the mouse, as they are to be seen in a piece of cheese gnawn and eaten by it.

"This struck me with such horror, that I cared not at that present moment whether I had been torn in a thousand pieces, for denying publicly that mouse-eaten God; I called to my best memory all philosophy concerning substance and accident, and resolved within myself that what I saw gnawn, was not an accident, but some real substance, eaten and devoured by that vermin, which certainly was fed and nourished by what it had eaten; and philosophy well teacheth, "substantia cibi (non accidentis) convertitur in substantiam aliti:" *the substance (not the accident of the food or meat) is converted or turned into the substance of the thing fed by it and alimented.* Now, here I knew that this mouse had fed upon some substance, or else how could the marks of the teeth so plainly appear? But no Papist will be willing to answer that it fed on the substance of Christ's body—ergo, by good consequence it follows, that it fed upon the substance of bread; and so transubstantiation here, in my judgment, was confuted by a mouse; which mean and base creature God chose to convince me of my former errors, and made me now resolve upon what many years before I had doubted, that certainly the point of transubstantiation, taught by the church of Rome, is most damnable and erroneous; for, besides what before, I observed, it contradicteth the philosophical axiom teaching that "duo contradictoria non possint simul et semel de eodem verificari," *two contradictories cannot at once and at the self same time be said and verified of the same thing;* but here it was so: for here in Rome's judgment and opinion, Christ's body was gnawn and eaten, and at the same time the same body, in another place, and upon another altar, in the hands of another priest, was not eaten and gnawn; therefore here are two contradictories verified of the same body of Christ—to wit, it was eaten and gnawn, and it was not eaten and gnawn. These impressions at that time were so great in me, that I resolved within myself that bread really and truly was eaten upon that altar, and by no means Christ's glorious body which is in heaven, and cannot be upon earth subject to the hunger or violence of a creature."

From the circumstance which I now read, we can clearly see that transubstantiation has no foundation in fact.

In the next place, permit me to remark, if a church be answerable for all who break from her communion, then is the church of Rome answerable, upon her own showing, for the various heresies which have from time to time existed. She will not perhaps assent to this doctrine; why therefore should she charge the Protestant communion with the faults of those

who depart out of it? If the mother be not answerable for the brood which leave her, then no Protestant church is answerable but for those within its pale.

Upon the authority of J. K. L. it is evident that there are differences in the church of Rome. Scarcely had he entered a foreign university for the completion of his studies, when he himself informs us, that he—

"Found himself surrounded by the disciples or admirers of D'Alembert, Rosseau, and Voltaire; that he frequently traversed in company with them the halls of the Inquisition, and discussed in the area of the holy office those arguments and sophisms, for the suppression of which this awful tribunal was *ostensibly* employed; and that at that time, the ardour of youth, the genius of the place, the spirit of the times, as well as the examples of his companions, prompted him to inquire into all things, and to deliberate, whether he should take his station among the infidels, or remain attached to Christianity. Letters on the State of Ireland, by J. K. L. 1825, p. 55.

Such is the authority from J. K. L. I assert, that the church of Rome is divided as to a standard Bible. The council of Trent gave its opinion, and pronounced its imprimatur, on an edition of the Vulgate, *before* it was published! "Quam emendatissime imprimatur," are the words of the council. The expression, "quam emendatissime," "as correct *as possible*," implies the inability of the church of Rome to furnish an infallible edition. I asserted that the Sixtine and Clementine editions differed in two thousand places. Mr. Maguire says that he has a copy of the Sixtine Bible. I again call upon him to produce it. I shall now read to you an extract, in order to show that he will find great difficulty in producing a copy:

"Biblia Sacra, Vulgata Edit. *Sixti V*, jussu recognita atque *edita Rom.* typis Vatic. fol. This is the remarkable edition of Sixtus V, suppressed by his successor Clement VIII, who reprinted it in 1592 more correctly. This has corrections pasted over it in great abundance: and nothing but its great rarity makes it bring any price. This celebrated and scarce edition of the Bible is called *Sixtus the Fifth's*, having been translated and printed under the direction of that pontiff. As soon as it appeared, it made a considerable noise in the church; but on account of the many alterations from the ordinary text, it was suppressed and proscribed after the death of Sixtus. The Duke of Grafton purchased one on large paper, at Mr. Paris's sale, for 64*l.* 5*s.* 0*d.*—(Dr. Adam Clarke's Bibliographical Dictionary, vol. i, p. 202.)

Let Mr. Maguire now produce his Sixtine Bible.

Divisions exist in the church of Rome, as to the extent of the temporal power of the Pope. On this subject Bellarmine tells us—

"There are three opinions. First, that the Pope, by divine right, has an unlimited power (plenissimam potestatem) over the whole world in political as well as ecclesiastical matters. A second opinion (which he calls a *heresy*, rather than an opinion) is in the opposite extreme; that the Pope has not by divine right, any temporal power; nor can in any way command secular princes, much less depose them, even though they may deserve to be otherwise deposed: nay, that it is contrary to the law of God that the spiritual

and temporal swords be both committed to the same hand. The third opinion lies between the two former, and *is commonly held by Catholic divines*, namely, that the Pope, as Pope, has not directly and immediately any temporal, but only a spiritual power; nevertheless, *that by reason of the spiritual, he has at least indirectly, a certain power, and that supreme in temporals.*"—De Rom. Pont. l. iv, c. 5. § 15.

The council of Lyons maintained the right of the Pope to depose princes. If I were a Roman Catholic, and were anxious to know whether the Pope possessed that right, although if a Trans-alpine, I must believe the doctrine, how can I reconcile it with the declaration of the Apostle:

"He that resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God; and they that resist, purchase to themselves damnation; for princes are not a terror to the good work but to the evil."—Rom. xiii, 1, 2, 3.

Delahogue endeavours to get out of difficulties of this nature, by saying,

"The church wished to define nothing concerning the celebrated controversy between the French and Italian churches, as is evident from those things which were done in the council of Trent, and from what we shall mention in the article concerning the prerogatives of the Roman pontiff. Therefore neither of these definitions is sufficiently clear to demand assent: hence different opinions concerning this question do not militate against unity of doctrine, which consists in this, that all doctrines are assented to, which have been clearly defined by a council *assuredly* general."—p. 51. certo œcumenica.

So that a man is left in doubt on such momentous points, by an infallible church, she not having defined the matter with sufficient clearness: a man therefore may maintain opinions different from those of others without any breach of unity. Upon the authority of Dr. Doyle, there is no standard as to doctrine in the church of Rome. In his examination on oath before the House of Lords, p. 502, he observes,

"Besides the articles enumerated in the creed of Pius IV, there are others to be received as of faith. These are defined in the *sacred* canons *of which some are received entire, some in part*, and of which no account can be obtained from the formularies to which the Roman Catholic bishops have referred as authentic."

Dr. Doyle here states that some of the sacred canons are to be received entire, some in part. Who then is to decide, what canons are to be received, and what rejected? How, I would ask, is the ignorant peasant to decide? Is he to go to his priest? The matter, in truth, resolves itself into this, that the priest is the *infallible* organ of the church in the estimation of the people. The differences in the church of Rome are also great as to councils. The French church receives the council of Constance *in toto*, others do not. Bellarmine gives us the varieties of opinion as to general councils. He furnishes a list of general councils, partly confirmed and partly rejected; (De Concilii l. i, c. 6.) and (in c. v. and de Rom. Pont l. iv, c. 11,) he says

that those councils allowed to be general were injured by the interpolations of heretics. The council of Basil once œcumenical, afterwards became, we are told, a schismatical conventicle.—(Bellarmine de Eccl. Mil. c. 16.) Is there then any standard of faith to be found in that church in which such doubts exist, as to its councils and canons.

The council of Constance, the Pope's legate concurring decreed that a council was above the Pope.—(Bellarm. de Rom. Pont. l. ii, c. 11.) That of Constance deposed three Popes, and set up another; while the council of Florence and Trent decreed, that the Pope is above a council. Here we have council against council. He has not informed us, what are the characteristics of a general council. Is it the orthodoxy of the doctrine which is to characterize a council, or is it the council which is to characterize the doctrine? If the former, why should the council of Tyre be rejected, which was summoned by the same authority as that of Nice? If the latter, who is to decide upon the characteristics of a general council?

Thus I have gone in some degree over the same ground of argument that I traversed the second day; by which I showed you that infallibility does not exist in the church of Rome. Some of the arguments which destroy its claim to infallibility, it is plain, overturn its pretensions to unity. The first council of Lyons has been doubted by some. The fifth Lateran by others. The fifth council, assembled at Constantinople, was held *in defiance* of Pope Vigilius; yet it has been received by his successors; and in fine throughout "the church" as an œcumenical council. Vide Baron. in Justiniano et Vigilio tom. 7, et Sirmund. Præfat. in Secund.

Let Mr. Maguire come to the point—let him, if he please, bring forward his catalogue of sects, and his stories about fanaticism; but let him also answer my questions, why councils have been against councils? and how his church can escape the anathema, which the council of Ephesus pronounced on any who should add to the Nicene confession of faith?

Mr. Maguire.—I called upon my friend Mr. Pope to prove that there is a distinction drawn in scripture between essentials and non-essentials. What he has adduced from St. Paul to the Corinthians makes against him. St. Paul rebukes the Corinthians because some amongst them said they were of Paul, others of Cephas, others of Apollos, and others of Christ; and he condemns their indulging in such frivolous contests. But faith, morality, and discipline had not been violated, and it is very foolish to bring this text forward as a proof that differences were allowed to exist. St. Paul on all occasions insisted upon

the necessity of charity; he tells us himself, that if he possessed faith sufficient to move mountains—that is, a faith of the strongest description—and had not charity, it would profit him nothing. In this instance the Corinthians were guilty of a breach of charity not of faith or discipline; they were making contentions and divisions as to the superior preaching of Paul or of Cephas, and St. Paul calls upon them equally to give up such frivolous contentions, and to live in charity. This text, though quoted by Mr. Pope, obviously makes against him, for here we find the Corinthians condemned for differences which did not involve matters of faith, morality, or discipline.

The arguments adduced by Mr. Pope against my church, are founded upon a great misconception of her doctrines. He has throughout manifested a surprising ignorance of her real tenets. He has resorted to a negative argument to prove a positive fact. Because St. Paul, in his epistle to the Romans does not speak of Peter, therefore Peter was never at Rome. Because St. Paul wrote an epistle to the Romans relative to the discharge of their moral and spiritual duties, and helped Peter in his mission, therefore St. Peter was not the successor of Jesus Christ upon earth.—A notable conclusion truly!

I affirm that our Saviour appointing a visible head for his church upon earth, acted in nowise derogatory to his heavenly character, but did that which was worthy of divine wisdom. My friend, by negative arguments, seeks to deprive us of a visible head—now Catholics acknowledge the Pope to be the successor of St. Peter, the visible head of the church on earth, and the agent and instrument of the invisible head, Jesus Christ, who is heaven. You are to decide whether you will believe the holy Fathers, or my friend Mr. Pope—you must reject either one or other, for they are directly opposed. Mr. Pope has made a quotation from Genebrardus. I affirm that if the context of the author be examined, it will not be found to prove any thing against Catholic doctrine. Mr. Pope seeks to establish the fact of disunion in the church by a reference to the battles amongst the Jesuits and Dominicans on the subject of the Conception. With regard to every thing which has not been defined by the Catholic church, every Catholic is at liberty to entertain his private opinions; the church has not thought proper to define any thing but what is necessary for the preservation of the deposit of faith. Mr. Pope recurs to the argument relative to the sacrificing priest. I have already said, that taking the words in the strict and rigorous sense, Christ can alone be called the sacrificing priest. He is the Assistans Pontifex futurorum bonorum. Christ himself is both the priest and the victim, or as St Augustin has it, he is the priest himself offering, and

himself the victim. The priest pronounces the words: Christ performs the action, therefore the priest himself does not transubstantiate. With regard to Columbanus, I deny that he is to be quoted on this subject as an authority against the Catholic church. His lucubrations on this subject have not been approved of. It is remarkable, that Mr. Pope quotes as Catholic historians those only who have risen in opposition to the recognised and lawful authority of the church.

I now come to the man who was converted by the mouse. What a powerful argument against the doctrine of transubstantiation! Mr. Pope imagines that he has caught me in a mouse-trap, but I will show that I can squeeze myself out of it. I worship a Saviour, who suffered himself to be spat upon and to be scoffed at. In his divine humility he endured all, and would not retaliate upon his enemies. He was treated as a common malefactor—he was crucified on the cross between two thieves—he was covered with every species of indignity and contumely, yet he prayed to his heavenly Father to forgive his enemies, for they knew not what they did. He was a scandal to the Jews, and a folly to the Gentiles. The indignities which our Saviour suffered from the Jews, should be an argument, according to the principles of Mr. Pope, against the divinity of the Redeemer—an argument which has been plausibly put forward, both by Jews and Gentiles. He says, the church of Rome is answerable for all heretics. They had been her adopted children, no doubt, but they abused their right—they rejected her authority, and she banished them from her on account of their scandalous conduct, as rebellious and unnatural children. They are gone out from her. He who left the ark of Noah was drowned in the deluge.

I defy my friend to point out any substantive error in the Sixtine edition of the Bible, or to prove that any material alterations were made in the Clementine edition. The council of Trent commanded that a copy should be made out *quam emendatissimé*. Though there was nothing substantially erroneous in the edition then extant, yet it required many verbal emendations: accordingly as he ought, Clement had a pure and correct copy of the Bible made out. Mr. Pope has recurred to the question of infallibility but I shall not be drawn by such a manœuvre from the subject before us. The doctrine of the priest may be infallibly true, although he himself may be very fallible. The priest is the organ of infallibility, as long as he teaches the true doctrine of the Catholic church; and I here publicly assure you, that if a priest broached any doctrine contrary to that church, when preaching from his altar, the people would close their ears against the new doctrine, and either turn him out of the chapel or retire

themselves. Mr. Pope has again alluded to the general councils, and has endeavoured to raise some cavilling objections with respect to the council of Basil. Though that council had been lawfully convened, yet, when eighty-nine Arian bishops were introduced by the Emperor, the Catholic bishops left the assembly, and refused to sit in council with the heretics. This is the council, forsooth, which Mr. Pope quotes against me! I already told you, that in the commencement the council was regularly convened, and therefore legitimate. Here lies the quibble of my ingenious friend. But the junta of Arian bishops created disgust and alarm in the minds of the orthodox bishops, and they accordingly quitted the heretical assembly. I have here a list which I shall now read to you, containing an enumeration of the various Protestant sectarians:

"Lutherans, Calvinists, Agricolists, Anabaptists, Re-baptizers, Storkites, Carlostadians, the three latter banished from Wittemberg by Luther for heresy, Muncer (executed for rebellion; 7000 Anabaptists killed:) Adamites, Apostolics, Taciturns, Perfects, Innocents, Libertines, Sabattarians, Clancularians, Manifestarians, Weepers, Rejoicers, Indifferents, Sanguinarians, Antimarians (a sect of Anabaptists;) Anidronicans, Antitrinitarians, Bacularians (a sect of Anabaptists, who deemed it a crime to have any other weapon than a staff;) Puritans, (a sect of rigid Calvinists, that indulged in various absurdities; some have killed cats for catching mice on a Sunday, but scrupulously deferred the execution till Monday; others have knocked out the heads of their barrels of beer for working on a Sunday, &c, &c,;) Quakers, Rustics, Insurrectionists, Sandemanians, by John Glass—Kiss-of-charity boys, Love-feasts, Seceders, Shakers, Socinians, Southcottians, Swedenborgians, or New Jerusalemites, Theophilanthropists, headed by Tom Paine, Universalists, or Salvation every where, Ubiquitarians, Zuinglians, Muggletonians, New-lights, Seekers, Armenians, David-Georgians, their author proclaimed himself the Messiah, Tunkers (not Tinkers,) they deny eternal punishment, Episcopalians, Familists, or Family of Love, their author held himself above Christ, Fifth-monarchy-men, Illuminati, Inspired boys, Independents, Infernalians, held Jesus went to hell and was tormented there, Johnsonians, deny the Trinity and pre-existence of Christ, Jumpers, Groaners, Laughers, Latitudinarians, Methodists, Robinsonians, Brownists, Ranters, Baptists, Pedobaptists, cum multus aliis."

Here we find tinkers and cobblers, and other such persons, setting up as the preachers of the word of God. Every one of those sects contends bitterly against the principles of the others and all of them differ more from each other than we do from the church of England.

Mr. Pope has retailed to you a blasphemous story relative to the blessed Eucharist, upon the credit of an apostate priest. I think it quite unworthy of a formal reply. I shall merely give you the following story by way of antithesis—it describes pretty accurarely the frantic fits produced by the imaginary workings of a certain spirit upon the imagination, highly sublimated with the pride and self-importance of private judgment. The story is related of a pious Puritan, who, in the presence of our traveller,

had executed holy justice on his favourite cat for an impious violation of the Sabbath—

Veni Banbury, oh! profanum!
Ubi vide Puritanum
Felem facientem furem
Quia Sabbato stravit murem.

Arrived at Banbury, oh! profane!
I there beheld a Puritan,
In pious rage hang up torn cat
For catching on Lord's day a rat.

I shall now read to you an extract from Dudithius, a learned Protestant divine, in his epistle to Beza:

"What sort of people are our Protestants, struggling to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine, sometimes to this side, sometimes to that! You may, perhaps, know what their sentiments in matters of religion are to-day: but you can never certainly tell what they will be to-morrow. In what article of religion do these churches agree which have cast off the bishop of Rome? Examine all from top to bottom, and you will scarce find one thing affirmed by one, which was not immediately condemned by another for wicked doctrine."

The same confusion of opinions was described by an English Protestant, the learned Dr. Walton, about the middle of last century, in his preface to his Polyglott, where he says—

"Aristarchus heretofore could scarce find seven wise men in Greece; but with us, scarce are to be found so many idiots. For all are doctors, all are divinely learned; there is not so much as the meanest fanatic or jackpudding, who does not give you his own dreams for the word of God. The bottomless pit seems to have been set open, from whence a smoke has arisen which has darkened the heavens and the stars, and locusts have come out with stings, a numerous race of sectaries and heretics, who have renewed all the ancient heresies, and invented many monstrous opinions of their own. These have filled our cities, villages, camps, houses, nay, our pulpits too, and lead the poor deluded people with them to the pit of perdition."

Such is the opinion of Dr. Walton, who will not be considered a light authority on the subject. I can also produce another excellent Protestant authority to the same effect:—no less than that of Baxter, the great oracle and organ of the sect of Puritans:—

"He who is out of the church is without the teaching, the holy worship, the prayers and discipline of the church; and is out of the way where the spirit doth come; and out of the society which Christ is related to. For he is the Saviour of the body; and if once we leave his hospital, we cannot expect the presence and help of the physician. Nor will he be pilot to them that leave his ship; nor captain to them that separate from his army. Out of the ark there is nothing but a deluge; and no place of rest, or safety for his soul."

In 1645, the collected body of ministers protested solemnly against the toleration of sects: and in their remonstrance they say,

"We detest and abhor the so-much-endeavoured toleration."

And in a provincial assembly, they denominate schism a "soul poison."

In another provincial meeting they call it :

" A sword in a madman's hand ; a cup of poison in the hands of a child a city of refuge in men's consciences for the devil to fly to."

In short, this, compressed ir to one word, was the general sentiment ; therefore the general language of these men was, that

" Schism is a damnable sin, and whatsoever is contrary to the gospel can have no right, and therefore should have no liberty."

Again, I have the authority of the learned Bayle for the destructive and ruinous consequences of schism :

" I do not know (says he) where one could possibly find out a more grievous sin than is that of rending the mystical body of Jesus Christ ; of that spouse which he has purchased at the expense of his own blood : of that mother whom he has begotten in God ; who feeds us with that milk of understanding, which is *devoid of fraud*: and conducts us in the path which leads to eternal happiness. What crime can indeed be possibly greater than to rise up against such a parent ; to defame her through the world ; and to make her children, when they can do it, rebel against her ; tear them by thousands from her womb, in order to drag them to *eternal flames ;* and not only them, but their posterity forever. Where does there exist a crime of high treason against God, if it be not here ? A husband who loves his wife, and is at the same time assured of her virtue, considers himself more mortally wounded by the calumnies and libels that would make her pass for a prostitute, than he would by any injuries proclaimed and published against himself. Amidst all the crimes into which a subject can fall, there is not any one more grievious than that of rebelling against his lawful sovereign, and endeavouring at the same time to excite as many provinces as he can to dethrone him. Now precisely in the same proportion as supernatural interests exceed all temporal interests, just so does the church of Christ surpass all civil societies. And the consequence, therefore, is, that schism in the church exceeds in the greatness of its criminality, the guilt of all other acts of sedition."

" Schism, (says Mr. Wix,) does not prevail merely out of the church. It abounds within it. And among those who profess themselves its members, very little attachment to it is to be found. It is, moreover, most seriously to be lamented, that very many of those, who boast the warmest attachment to her docirines, have arrogated to themselves the knowledge of the gospel, in a sense, which excludes all others from a due conception of it, whose opinions, or feelings, accord not with their own. In consequence of this, we observe much spiritual disorder ; a variety of opinions of faith, and discipline both in the church, and out of the church. And thus the greatest injury is inflicted on the unity of the gospel of Jesus Christ."

Such, too, is the language of many other writers of the establishment.

" The establishment, (said one of its most eloquent prelates) is a tree, that is shivering to pieces with wedges made out of itself."

Dr. Daubeney, a Protestant divine, speaking of the Methodists, says,

" They are a set of ignorant, self-sufficient enthusiasts, industriously pushing themselves into every parish, creeping into houses, and leading captive those silly persons who are weak enough to be led by them. They are, many of them, of so low a description, as to be obliged to substitute their marks for their names."

" In this country (observes M. Stykes) vast sums of money are gained by schism : and prodigious collections are annually made for the support of its ministers. Inferior persons, assuming the situation of teachers, are leaders

of the multitude —Thus in the worship of calves, (1 Kings, xii, 33) the priests were made of the lowest of the people. It would now seem, having preachers of all sorts, as if we had Moses' wish; and all the people were prophets —(Num. xi, 28.)

Dr. Daubeney informs us, that there was a seminary in Bath

"In which *boys* are trained for preaching; and at about twelve or thirteen years of age, when considered qualified for public exhibition, are sent to undertake the services of religion."

Speaking of the tiny heroes of the pulpit, Dr. Valpy tells us, that one of them,

"A lad twelve years old, went about the country preaching *extempore*. He became popular, and was much admired and patronised."

This accounts, at once, both for the multitude of our preachers, and for the confusion which they generate;—*preaching is now a very profitable*, and a very *lazy trade*.

"Each pious 'prentice freely may dispense
Salvation; licensed now for eighteen pence:
And should devotion tempt him from his awl,
He'll get his orders, if he gets his call."—*Religio Clerici.*

I could adduce a number of other Protestant authorities, all condemning in the most positive terms the disunion which exists in the Protestant churches. It is unanimously admitted by all, that they have no fixed and common principle to direct them. Mr. Pope set up his private judgment, and would have every man worship it as an idol. He contends that all have a right to exercise their private judgment, and to choose what religion they please. According to his principles, that book which is inspired of God, will be made to dictate 150 different religions—the spirit of truth will be changed into the spirit of error. Every wild fanatic will appeal to private interpretation, and internal illumination. The book of God will be produced to support the most abominable blasphemies, and real religion will be utterly destroyed. It was that devastating principle which superinduced the ruin of the Protestant religion in the Protestant churches of Germany and France. It was by such a principle that the Episcopal church of Scotland was pulled down; and the same principle will effect shortly similar results in Ireland, in regard to the established church, if it meet with the encouragement it has hitherto received. I call upon the bishops of the established church to step into the breach, and to save their church from utter destruction. If they do not oppose this principle—if the Catholics do not step forward and perform their duty in counteracting such a destructive principle, the bishops and parsons of the established church must soon give way to the low, ignorant, pettifogging, self-sufficient preachers of "the word." This language may appear strange in my mouth: but I should rather see the Protestant established church continue, than that it should

be overturned by such men. Tenets have been falsely imputed to the Catholics, which they have frequently and publicly denied Our articles of faith have been publicly defined by the church; and all persons who are willing to inquire, can easily learn what those articles are.

Mr. Pope has ridiculed the honest man, of whom Bellarmine speaks, and who, when asked what was his belief, replied, that he believed what the church believed. That is my doctrine--I believe what the church believes, and the church believes what I believe. I have been long looking for the particular opinions which constitute the rule of faith professed by my friend—but he has abstained from any thing of the kind. He could not prove, that any three books of the Old or New Testament are absolutely inspired, unless, indeed, we admit the authority of his internal evidence. According to him, that internal evidence is a meridian sun, which illuminates the sacred volume. If so—it is strange, that though such a powerful light should be in existence, so many should be involved in darkness, and that there should have been millions of Catholics, who, for 1800 years, could never discover this light, which, according to Mr. Pope, shines forth with such resplendent lusture. But it is but an airy phantom—a wandering meteor which leads not to truth, but to doubt and error. It is the production of heated and enthusiastic imaginations. The ancient heretics laid no claim to internal evidence—they denied its existence. They wanted that borrowed light which illumines the Evangelizers of the present day. If this internal evidence be so plain and discernable, as Mr. Pope would have us believe, why was it not claimed by the ancient heretics—why did so many millions remain so unconscious of its existence, and why did it continue so long hidden and obscured, as it were by a cloud, until the noon-day of evangelical reformation had arrived? How could all this happen, if this light shine forth directing to that city, which is built upon a mountain, and which can be seen by all men?

Mr. Pope.—Gentlemen, I have already referred to the epistle to the Romans, to prove the distinction between fundamental and non-fundamental doctrines. I admit the evil of exalting one man above another by saying "I am of Paul, and I of Apollos," and we charge the church of Rome with saying, "I am of Cephas," or Peter, though forbidden by St. Paul.

"Whereas there is among you envying and contention, are you not carnal and walk according to man? For while one saith, I indeed am of Paul, and another, I am of Apollos; are you not men? What then is Apollos and what is Paul? The ministers of Him whom you have believed, and to every one as the Lord hath given."—1 Cor. iii, 3, 4 5.

In proof that Paul, as well as Peter, founded the church of Rome, I referred to the testimony of Irenæus. Mr. Maguire I am authorized to say, has full permission to consult the library of Trinity college, in order to examine my quotations. As to the argument about the Deists, I appeal to men of sense, whether that objection has not been answered. The Roman Missal (in the Rubric de Defectibus, circ. Miss. Occurrentibus,) has a whole chapter on the accidents which may occur in the celebration of the mass. I beg to call your most particular attention to that part of said Rubric. As to the number of sects, I would observe, that the Protestants reject many of them. The church of Rome has done the same. Why are not real Protestants, as well as the church of Rome, entitled to disclaim alliance with those who are in error? We have council against council. The council of Ephesus anathematizes any, who should add to the Nicene creed. I ask, is not Pius IV, who has added thereto so many articles, distinctly condemned, as well as all who make use of this creed? Yet that is the creed adopted by Roman Catholics at this day.

The second council of Nice assigns, as one reason for worshipping the image of Christ, that he is not sensibly present on earth, but only in his divinity.—Act. 4, p. 305. It also anathematizes all who assert that Christ was not circumscribed as to his human nature. Is not this the church of one age against the church of another?

As to the doctrine of *intention*, "saltem faciendi quod facit ecclesia,"—(Trent Conc. Sess. v. can. 11.) I have heard a difference of opinion expressed—(so much for unity.) At the discussion at Carlow, a Roman Catholic priest, under the jurisdiction of Dr. Doyle, asserted that the doctrine of intention was *merely a probable opinion among divines.*

The rubric of the Missal says,

"If any priest should have before him eleven hosts and should INTEND to consecrate only ten, not determining which ten he intends, in these cases he does not consecrate, BECAUSE INTENTION IS REQUIRED. It is otherwise, if thinking indeed that there are ten, *he should wish* however to consecrate all the hosts before him; for then all will be consecrated, and therefore the priest ought always to have such intention, namely, of consecrating all those which are placed before him for consecration."—Roman Missal, Dublin, Richard Coyne, 1822, Rubric de Defect. p. 53.

And here permit me to inquire, as transubstantiation depends on the intention of the priest, how is an individual to know whether the priest has the intention? Can he enter into his heart? In cases where there is no transubstantiation, is there not direct idolatry in worshipping that which, by the acknowledgment of the church of Rome, is not God? and how can any individual, according to such a principle, be sure that he is not

guilty of idolatry, the intention of the priest being necessary to transubstantiation? The people, therefore, cannot know, even according to their own principles, whether they worship God or not. I shall be told that it is not the fault of the people, for they do not mean to worship that which is not consecrated, but to worship God. So say idolaters—we only worship God through the image. Hence, this mode of arguing would justify idolatry generally. Again; bear in mind, that this doctrine of intention is not confined to the eucharist; it runs through the whole system. How does Mr. Maguire know whether Popes and Bishops, at ordinations, have always intended to ordain? How does Mr. Maguire know whether he is a priest or not? He is not certain that the bishop who ordained him, intended to ordain him. Neither does he know whether he is baptized or not; for unless the officiating priest had intention, the outward ceremony failed: marriage also according to the church of Rome, is null and void, unless intention accompanies the performance of the ceremony on the part of the priest. See, then, the awful results of this pernicious doctrine!

My friend took hold of an expression in an extract from Theodoret, which I quoted yesterday. I again say, that his argument would fail if he believed in transubstantiation. The change in which he believed, was a *moral* change. I admit his language is strong. I shall read to you another passage:—

"Jacob, (says Orthodoxus,) called the blood of the Saviour the blood of the grape. For, if the Lord be denominated a vine, and if the fruit of the vine be called wine, and if from the side of the Lord fountains of blood and water, circulating through the rest of his body passed to the lower parts; well and seasonably did the patriarch say, He washed his garments in wine, and his clothes in the blood of grapes. As we then call the mystic fruit of the vine after its consecration, the blood of the Lord, so he called the blood of the true vine, the blood of the grape.—Our Saviour indeed, changed the names; for to his body he gave the name of the symbol, while to the symbol he gave the name of his blood; and, having called himself a vine, he thence consistently applied the appellation of his blood to the symbol. But the scope of such language is perfectly familiar to those who have been initiated into the mysteries. For our Lord required that they who partake of the divine mysteries, should not regard the nature of the things which they see; but that in the change of names they should believe that change which is wrought by grace. Inasmuch as he who called his own natural body wheat and bread, and who further bestowed upon himself the appellation of a vine; he also honoured the visible sympols with the name of his body and blood, NOT CHANGING THEIR NATURE, BUT ADDING GRACE TO NATURE."—Theod. Dial. i, oper. vol. iv, p. 17, 18.

As to Pope Gelasius, it does not much matter whether the work from which I quoted, was written by him or by Gelasius Cyzinicus; it proves that opposition was made to transubstantiation, a doctrine which was *growing* at that time.

The council of Chalcedon decreed, that equal honour should

be paid to the bishops of Rome and Constantinople. On the contrary, the Pope is now called God's supreme vicar. With respect to general councils, Gregory Nazianzen, writing to Procopius, says,

"To tell you plainly, I am determined to fly all conventions of bishops. For I *never yet* saw a council that ended happily. Instead of lessening, they invariably augment this evil."

Here is the opinion of a man respecting councils, who had himself been present at the second general council.

The Marquess of Pescara, Panan, who was present at the council of Trent, as the charge d'affairs of the Spanish ambassador, used often to say, that

"*He deserved much credit for being a Christian, after having been present at two elections of Popes, and at one council.*"—See Literary Life of Don Joaquin Lorenzo De Villanueva, 2d vol. Append. Lo sucecido en el concilio de Trento desde 1561 hasta que se acabo, written by Don Pedro Gonzalez de Mendoza, bishop of Salamanca.

From the testimony of a Roman Catholic, you may judge of the purity and principles by which the Fathers of the council of Trent were actuated. Mr. Maguire talks of infallibility being calculated to end divisions. The Inquisition itself cannot suppress the inward feelings of the heart. The church of Rome may succeed in putting down outward dissensions. But such peace is like that of the dogs of Scylla, who howled and barked at each other, and then retreated into the unity of her cavernous womb.

The church of Rome, even in her boasted uniformity of worship and ordinances is not agreed. For instance, the church of Abyssinia offered about 200 years ago, to adopt the Pope as the supreme head of the church. On that occasion the court of Rome did not require that the Abyssinian ceremonies, which were quite different from those of Rome, should be changed. The Pope received the ambassador from the emperor of Abyssinia; and the pope's secretary declared, that the said emperor should always be considered as the true son of his holiness. Nevertheless, the Abysinians at that time were Eutychians—they circumcised their children; they observed the Jewish sabbath; they communicated under two kinds—they did not believe in the absolute necessity of baptism, and rejected the seven sacraments.—"Francis Alvarez, his description of Ethiopia."

The Maronites were also united to the church of Rome, because they acknowledged the Pope's supremacy; still they retained all their own ceremonies, which they performed in their own language.—(See the observations subjoined by Rich. Simon, to his French translation of the Italian Jesuit Dandini's Voyage to Mount Libanus, published in 12mo. at Paris. See also Euseb Renaudot, Historia Patriarch, Alexand. p. 548.)

further; I charge Mr. Maguire himself, with holding principles contrary to his own church. First, he says, that Protestants are not heretics. I reply, that his church describes all who are out of her pale, as "infidels, heretics, and excommunicated persons." Dr. French, a Roman Catholic bishop of Ferns, in his "Doleful Fall of Andrew Sall," says, that the church of England, both priests and people, as well *secundum præsentem* as *secundum futuram justitiam*, are out of the mystical ark of Christ. Dr. O'Reilly, in his catechism, says, that it is necesary for the soul, on pain of damnation, to be obedient to the see of Rome. Does Mr. Maguire, by opposing this doctrine, exemplify the unity of the system? Mr. Maguire has this day contradicted the principle which he laid down before—namely, that it was sufficient for the churches in communion with Rome to agree in essentials, though not in non-essentials: and we are now informed, that there is no such distinction. The church of Rome holds that the scriptures are to be interpreted "secundum sensum quem tenet ecclesia, et unanimem consensum patrum," according to the opinion of the church, and the unanimous consent of the Fathers, in matters of faith and *morals* pertaining to the edification of Christian doctrine "in rebus fidei et *morum* ad Christianæ doctrinæ ædificationem pertinentibus."

As to the anathema being annexed to none but to articles of faith, I refer to the 4th session of the council of Trent:

"It shall be lawful for none to print, or cause to be printed, any books on sacred subjects, without the name of the author, or for the future to sell them, or even to keep them, except they be first examined and approved of by the Ordinary, *under pain of an anathema.*"

I should like to know, was the matter thus prohibited an article of faith? Again, in the 27th canon of the 3d council of Lateran, it is said,

"Therefore, we are resolved to subject to anathema all who shall presume to receive or shelter in their houses or lands those who are called Puritans Patrins, or Publicans."

I should like to know, whether this injunction related to a matter of faith? My friend, in the distinction which he has drawn, has contradicted the assembly of Jerusalem, which Mr. Maguire called the great exemplar of councils. That assembly *made no decree on matters of faith*, as may be seen by consulting the 15th of Acts. Mr. Maguire has referred to some cases of fanaticism, You have doubtless heard of the revelations of Sister Nativite. I shall give you one of her revelations A message with which, she said, she was charged from heaven to deliver, was, that her sister nuns should leave off wearing linen chemises, and wear flannel ones again, in conformity to the

rule of their order! These revelations are the production of which Dr. Milner said,

"I cannot speak too highly of the sublimity and affecting piety of these revelations in general."—See Revelations de la Sœur Nativité. Paris, 1817

This is the work of which an English Jesuit of our own day has observed, that if the whole scriptures were lost, all their most valuable moral, doctrinal, and theological science might be recovered here, and with interest!!

Did Mr. Maguire never read of the Feast of the Ass, that was celebrated in several churches and cathedrals in France, in the 15th century? The gross absurdities then practised would exceed belief, were they not recorded by faithful witnesses. A young woman richly dressed, with an infant in her arms, was placed on an ass, and led in great ceremony to the altar, where high mass was performed; and a hymn, replete with blasphemy, was sung in his praise by the whole congregation: and what is still more remarkable for its folly and profanation, the priest used at the conclusion of the ceremony, as a substitution of the words with which he dismissed the people, to bray three times like an ass, which was answered by three simular brays by all the people. We have heard a good deal about Johanna Southcote. Did Mr. Maguire never hear that the founder of the order of preaching friars, founded also, in 1206, an order of preaching sisters. There is, however, this great distinction between the Protestants and the Roman Catholic church,—Protestants reject all such fanatics as Johanna Southcote; the church of Rome does not. Has Mr. Maguire not heard of St. Teresa de Jesus? There is a collection of sermons written in Spanish, by Francis Fernando De Lara y Villamayor, of the order of our Lady of Mount Carmel: and this book is approved of by the general of his order, and also by the doctors of the university of Alcala, and by his bishop, and by the king of Spain's secretary; in which there are three sermons in eulogy of the seraphic mother St. Teresa. In one of the discourses the preacher informs us, how this blessed woman became the only female doctor that ever was in the Catholic church; and in order that she might obtain that honour, and as the doctors of Salamanca hesitated about admitting a female to the honour of the doctorate, he relates that her chin was endowed with a long beard, and that the learned men of that university, seeing this phenomenon, no longer hesitated to give her the degree.

"And thus, (says the preacher,) though by nature she was a woman, yet in prowess and by virtue of her beard she was a man, and that one of the most bearded man that ever graduated in that seat of learning."

The learned preacher then goes on to prove from scripture,

that Solomon had St. Teresa in his contemplation in the 31st chapter of Proverbs, "who can find a virtuous woman."

"Mulierem fortem quis inveniet—quien hallara una muger fuerte, Valgame Dios! tan dificil es hallar una muger fuerte? Si; que no es muger fuerte como querra de la que habla la letra—seno una muger que siendo fuerte, fuesse santa, y buena, Mulierem bonam, leyo el Caldeo—Mulierem omni virtute cumulatam, leyeron otras, una muger con todas las vertudes adornada—Mulierem audacem ad res genendas, leyo Baino una, muger audaz para todas las impresas—Mulierem heroinam Leyeron otros, una muger heroo excellentissimo. Mulierem virilem, leyeron los Setenta: una muger varon en lo varonil mulierem masculam, leyo Vatablo una muger Macho que explica mas que varon porque explica hombre mui barbado. Essa es la muger que pregunta Solomon? pues mui bien dice, que quien la hallara? quis inveniet porque muger y con tantas prendas es mui dificil de encontrar, Mulierem fortem quis inveniet."

The preacher then goes on to ask in an animated style, who is this woman that Solomon has foretold should be found in the church?

"I will tell you, (says he,) since I know what answer heaven has given to the question: for on a certain day while the canonization of the Senora doctress was pending, as one of the sisters of our lady of Mount Carmel was wrapt in contemplation of all the praises the church had lavished on this its glorious saint, and as she looked up to heaven she saw a piece of writing fall from the skies at her feet; and taking it up, she read therein, 'Christ has formed for himself a brave woman.' Then the daughter of our lady of Mount Carmel cried out,'O sisters, our holy mother is the stout mother of the church. O lady and doctress, it well becomes you; our Mount Carmel indeed enjoys the riches of possessing a mother of such prowess—the university of Salamanca enjoys the glory of having you as a graduated doctress in its schools; our own Spain rejoices in having a Spanish woman such a Spanish man in prowess; and the whole church glories in having a woman with a beard.—Mulierem Virilem, Mulierem Masculam.'"

You shall now have a specimen of the divinity of St. Anthony. On the text Matt. xi, "Take my yoke upon you, &c," he begins his sermon with this question—"What! are the Apostles then oxen?" And the most of his discourse is to show, that the Apostles were oxen; for seven reasons, some of which are these,—

"Because the Apostles were sent by pairs, like oxen, Acts 13, 'Separate to me Saul and Barnabas,' &c. 2. Because an ox is a strong and laborious animal: so St. Paul says, 'He laboured more abundantly than they all.' 3. An ox spends little, though it labours much: and one of the Apostles says, 1 Tim. 6, 'Having food and raiment, let us therewith be content:' but some prelates in our time are palfreys, that spend much, and labour little. 4. Because an ox has two horns; and that which answers in the Apostles to these two horns, is doctrine and life. Hence that preacher is an unicorn, who has but one of these; with this horn preachers ought to blow, that is, with good doctrine in preaching; which yet often profits little, unless it be accompanied with the other horn, that is, good life. Another cason is because there is nothing in an ox unprofitable; so neither in the life of the Apostles.—Of the hide of the one, shoes are made, and from the conversation of the Apostles, an example is taken, which fortifies the affections, as a shoe does the feet: Cant. 7, 'How beautiful are thy goings in shoes.'"—Serm. S. de Apost. p. 428

In the concluding passage are expressions, which I cannot read.

My friend knows something of the Breviary of his church. It contains some most extravagant narratives, For instance we read of St. Cecilia, a martyr, that when the axe was employed, the executioner in vain endeavoured to sever the delicate neck of his victim; which, being but half divided, allowed her to live for three days, at the end of which she died!

Again—His holiness travelling to Corinth, and being in want of a safe horse, borrowed one which the lady of a certain nobleman used to ride, The animal carried the Pope with the greatest gentleness, and when the journey was finished, was sent back to his mistress: but in vain did the lady attempt to enjoy the wonted services of her favourite steed. The horse had become unmanageable, and gave the lady many an indecorous fall, "as if (says the Breviary,) feeling indignant at having to carry a woman, since the vicar of Christ had been on his back." The horse was in consequence presented to the Pope, worthy only of such a rider. Brev. Rom. die 27 Maii.

This, gentlemen, is the Breviary of the Roman Catholic church, compiled in obedience to a decree of the council of Trent. Pope Pius V, having ordered a number of learned and able men to prepare it, sanctioned it by his bull *quod a nobis*, July 1566, and commanded the clergy of the Roman Catholic church all over the world to make use of it. I could also read an account of a strange composition, called the Eternal Gospel, "Evangelium Æternum;" but time does not permit.

In the conclusion of this important discussion, I beg to remind my friend about the passage from Sir Edwin Sandys, and the application of the term ἱερευς in the New Testament. A gentleman seemed to insinuate, that I received assistance in this meeting—I can truly deny the charge. Can I say the same for my opponent? He on the first day was not able to take notes, but notes were taken for him. Hear me, gentlemen; I hold in my hand the document. Thereon is written,

7th. As to the the Editions of the Scriptures. What Bible am I to take as authentic?

Obs.—How this acts powerfully in proof of the necessity of a LIVING expositor to check all typographical errors as well as others.

9th. As to the Salt *of the earth*—denies the chemistry—IMMATERIAL.

10th. The Lord is the one shepherd.

Obs.—*On this* what a *disjointed fold*—and—Obs.—The phrase is, One fold, and one Shepherd.

"Litera Scripta manet." When I was going away, I happened to find this document left on the table, and put it amongst my papers, and afterwards discovered that it contained the hints which I have noticed. Will my opponent say, that he has re

ceived no assistance in this very room, when a gentleman, who shall be here nameless, furnished such suggestions to him. His remark about the salt was, perhaps, the strongest point which he made, and this presents itself in the notes before us.

He says he quoted a passage, by which my ignorance of scripture was exposed. Pardon me for here remarking that I have read at least the Douay *Testament* with some attention, for the purpose of making a comparison between it and the authorized version. The passage to which Mr. Maguire has refered is—

"No man knoweth whether he be worthy of love or hatred." Ecclesiastes, ix, 1.

The Protestant version reads,

"No man knoweth either hate or love."

I ask any man to compare this Douay translation with the Protestant version, and he will discover the difference to be so great, as considerably to change the sense. Let both be compared with the original, and I will venture to say that the Protestant version is correct.

Mr. Maguire called upon Mr. Pope to read the rest of the passage.

Mr. Pope observed, I cannot occupy my time in doing so.

We are drawing to the termination of the discussion. I have brought forward fair and undeniable facts, showing that the church of Rome is often opposed to the church of Rome, doctor against doctor, Pope against Pope, in proof that the unity, boasted of, does not exist, and that the church of Rome is not infallible. If, as I have proved, the church of Rome contradicts herself, inasmuch as two contradictions cannot be true—the church of Rome cannot be infallible. Her infallibility therefore goes to the ground, and all the superstructure raised upon it. Nor is this all. This pretension to infallibility is the millstone about her neck, which, though, "she sit as a queen upon the waters," will sink her into the abyss. Her doctrine must be brought to the test of revelation, and the right of private judgment must be recognized. My friend has himself departed from the system of the church of Rome, and has brought her principles to the bar of private judgment, and thereby given a practical proof of the unity which exists in the church of Rome.

I received yesterday evening a letter from the Rev. Prince Crawford, Curate of St. Mary's, Donnybrook; permit me to read it:

"Dear Sir.—Having read in the public papers a report of the controversy at present pending between you and Mr Maguire, in which he in a most

decided manner denies that he uttered any thing at the Carrick meeting which could be considered as a challenge, I beg to state that through accidental circumstances I met the gentleman who reported the proceedings of that meeting, that he expressed considerable surprise at Mr. Maguire's denial, and in the most unequivocal manner, declared, that after the meeting was over, he (the reporter) retired to the hotel, for the purpose of arranging his notes; that while so engaged, Mr. Maguire entered the room, when the reporter observed to him, that he had now brought Mr Pope on his back, as he had given a direct challenge to him, and that a meeting was unavoidable. That then the reporter read his notes as they have appeared in print, when Mr. Maguire acknowledged them to be a faithful statement of his words, and added that what he had said he would stand to, and that though all the sons of Adam were congregated against him, he would not fear them. The reporter's name is —— -. And as I am an advocate for truth, you have every permission to use this document as you may think proper.

I remain, dear Sir, your's very faithfully

"PRINCE CRAWFORD, Curate of St. Mary's Donnybrook."

My correspondent mentions the name of the reporter. I feel it unnecessary to give it on this public occasion. My friends, you can determine whether a system, which has recourse to such expedients to support itself, can be from God. And here I beg leave to notice an assertion of Mr. Eneas M'Donnell, made to two gentlemen, whose names can be given—"that at Ballinasloe, after a policeman had run his bayonet into M'Donnell's leg, I cheered him to go on." The whole is false. I did not stir from my place, and would willingly have prevented, as far as my ability might have enabled me, the police from doing an injury to any Roman Catholic, if such had been intended. In reference to Cavan, you have read in the public prints the various contradictions of statements put forward by ecclesiastics of the church of Rome. Now I ask you as honest men, can that system have proceeded from the God of truth, which has recourse to such manœuvring, and adopts principles of action so contradictory to the tenor of the holy writ?

Mr. MAGUIRE.—I imagined after Mr. Pope had apologized for the intolerable language which he made use of yesterday—I thought that after apologizing in the presence of that God whose name he so often invokes, he would not have indulged in similar irascibility, and that we should not have had from him another display of the spleen. I appeal to the meeting, to say whether I have not conducted myself with good temper towards Mr. Pope during this discussion—I appeal to the meeting, if I have betrayed the same irascibility towards him. Mr. Pope brought forward a document to prove that I had received assistance during this discussion, and that suggestions were handed to me by a gentleman whom it was unnecessary for him to name. A single observation will set you right on the subject. I neglected on the first day of this discussion to take notes— I thought my

memory would preserve the heads of the arguments advanced Some notes were taken for me by Mr. O'Connell—but I declare solemnly that I never saw a line or syllable of the document now produced by Mr. Pope. I never got a hint about the argument on the salt of the earth. Though I do not imagine myself a great scholar, I do not think there are many at this meeting who knew more of that particular point than I did myself. Mr. Pope has acknowledged that it was one of the best hits which I made against him. It was he himself who introduced the subject. I am sorry that Mr. Pope will not allow this meeting to pass over with the regularity which distinguished it from the commencement, but that a drop of the poisoned chalice must be infused into our good humour. With regard to the reporter of the meeting at Carrick-on-Shannon, I repeat what I have already publicly stated in the newspapers, and I am satisfied to abide the result, that I never authorized the report in question, and that I had no communication with the person who reported the proceedings of that meeting. I knew when I made this statement at the commencement of this discussion, that there were many persons in Carrick-on-Shannon, who would be glad to detect me in stating what was not the fact. I now appeal, with confidence, to the Protestants who were present at the meeting in Carrick-on-Shannon, whether my statement be not correct. The fact is, that save during that meeting, I have never seen the reporter, except when coming to Dublin on the outside of the Longford coach. And I here declare that, in the presence of four Protestants the challenge of Mr. Pope was put into my hands. I now return to the subject of our discussion; I repeatedly called upon Mr. Pope to show from scripture a distinction between essentials and non-essentials. I have already proved to you, that in the passage quoted from St. Paul, there was no difference made between doctrine and discipline, but that the disputes amongst the people relative to the superiority of their preachers, formed a breach of charity which the Apostle would not tolerate. Mr. Pope says that Peter denied Christ, and upon this fact he argues that Peter could not be infallible; but he makes no distinction between the commission of sin, and a breach of divine faith. Christ says to Peter—

"Simon, Simon, behold Satan hath desired to have you, that he may sift you as wheat. But I have prayed for thee that thy faith fail not; and thou being once converted, confirm thy brethren."

That is when converted from the sin which he had committed, he was to confirm his brethren. Here our Saviour tells us that the faith of Peter should not fail. Now, either Peter's faith failed, or it did not—if it failed, we must suppose that the prayer of our Saviour to his heavenly Father was inefficacious My

friend has reminded me of Theodoret. I re-assert, that in the quotation* read by Mr. Pope from Theodoret, the word "venerate" is substituted for the word "adore"—what is the fact? Theodoret wrote four books against the Eutychians, who denied the reality of the human nature in Christ, in which he introduces two persons under the names of Orthodoxus and Erranistes, who mutually discuss the subject—the first is the Catholic believer—the second the Eutychian advocate. In the first dialogue the reality of Christ's presence in the Eucharist, otherwise the doctrine of transubstantiation, had been established; but in the second the subject is resumed. and the change of the bread and wine distinctly pointed out—the first question is put by Orthodoxus. He asks Erranistes:—

ORTHODOX.—"Tell me now; the mystical symbols which are offered to God by the priests of what are they the symbols?"

ERRANISTES.—"OF THE BODY AND BLOOD OF THE LORD."

OR.—"Of his true body or not?"

ERR.—"Of his true body."

OR.—"Very well; for every image must have its original."

ERR.—"I am happy you have mentioned the divine mysteries: tell me, therefore, what you do call the gift that is offered before the Priest's invocation?"

OR.—"This must not be said openly, for some may be present who are not initiated."

ERR.—"Answer then in hidden terms."

OR.—"We call it an aliment of certain grains."

ERR.—"And how do you call the other symbols?"

OR.—"We give it a name that denotes a certain beverage."

ERR.—"And after the consecration what are they called?"

OR.—"The body of Christ, and the blood of Christ."

ERR.—"μετα δεγε τον αγεασμον.

OR.—"σωμα χριστου, και αιμα χριστου.

ERR.—"And you believe that you partake of the body and blood of Christ!"

OR.—"So I believe."

ERR.—"As the symbols then of the body and blood of Christ were different before the consecration of the Priest, and after that consecration are changed, in the same manner we (Eutychians) say the body of Christ after his ascension was changed into the divine essence."

OR.—"Thou art taken in thine own net; for after the consecration the mystical symbols lose not their proper nature; they remain in the former substance, figure, and appearance, (or as some translate it, in the shape and form of the former substance,) to be seen and understood to be what they have been made; this they are believed to be; and as such they are adored."

Thus Theodoret turned the comparison of Eutyches (who believed in transubstantiation) against himself—viz: that as the elements of bread and wine remained after consecration so as to be seen and felt—that is, as far as the senses were concerned; so Christ's humanity did remain after its hypostatical union with his divinity.

* Mr. Pope begs to say, with Mr. Maguire's concurrence, that he gave the passage from Theodoret, as he found it translated in Faber's 'Difficulties of Romanism."—Lond. 1826, p. 141.

With respect to the council of Ephesus having decreed, that nothing should be added to what had been determined upon by the council of Nice, I agree that it did so. But will it be said that when other articles, besides those noticed in the council of Nice, happened to be denied by heretics, that such articles should not be determined and explained by other and succeeding councils? According to the same line of argument, as the word consubstantial was not mentioned at the council of Jerusalem, the Arians might have argued, that it should not be introduced at the council of Nice. The council of Ephesus only meant that nothing was to be added to what had been commanded by our Saviour, and handed down to us by the Apostles. Mr. Pope says, it would be direct idolatry in the Catholics to adore the host, as it may happen not to be consecrated. I will read to you the opinion of no less a man than the celebrated Protestant divine, Dr. Thorndyke, on the subject:

"Will any Papist acknowledge that he honours the elements of the Eucharist for God? Will common sense charge him with honouring that in the sacrament which he does not believe to be there? ..... Those who say that Papists, by worshipping the host, are guilty of idolatry, only lead Protestants by the nose.

But when the ancient idolaters prayed to Baal and their idols, (*simulacra*, dumb things, as they are called in holy writ) prove to me that they only intended to worship God, and not the idols themselves, when they offered up adoration to them, and I shal give up the argument. Let Mr. Pope show, if he can, by proper documents, that I have contradicted Catholic doctrine, and let him not stand up here to attack that which he does not understand. I could quote thirty Protestant writers to disprove the charge of idolatry against the Roman Catholic church, showing, that even if the elements of the sacrament do not undergo a transubstantiation, Catholics are not guilty of idolatry, as their worship is directed to Christ, into whose body and blood they believe the elements have been transubstantiated. I have here the dialogue of Theodoret, and I shall repeat his words—

ORTHODOX.—"Tell me of what are the mystical symbols offered to God by the Priest?"
ERRANISTES.—"Of the body and blood of the Lord."
OR.—"Of his true body or not?"
ERR.—"Of his true body."
OR.—"Very well; for every image must have its original."
ERR.—"And after the consecration what are they called?"
OR.—"The body of Christ, and the blood of Christ."

Again, he asserts that I said, that the Catholics are agreed only in essentials, and that I confined my statement to that. I deny the assertion—I publicly said, that even in discipline they are not allowed to disagree, for the smaller the cause of dispute the greater would be the scandal, because the less justifiable.

Mr. Pope has quoted Dr. Milner. When he can produce a passage from the great Dr. Milner opposed to any point of Catholic doctrine, he will be an extraordinary man indeed. He also gave us a quotation from a second Blanco White. I appeal to this meeting whether it be fair to produce those men as witnesses against the Catholic church, who have apostatized from her communion, and who, in order to justify their apostasy endeavour to blacken the church which they have deserted, in every possible way—men who endeavour to exhibit her as the scarlet lady of the seven hills, and her visible head as anti-christ? By-the-bye, the latter elegant phrases are not so much in vogue at the present day, nor so frequently employed against the Catholic church as they were in the days of the reformers. It is wonderful to see how people will retrace their steps. In the early English Protestant translations of the Bible, *congregation* was used for the word *church*, and *elder* for *bishop*. But when the Protestants got possession of the tithes and green acres, church and bishop were restored in the Bible. Is it not very foolish, to say the least of it, for Mr. Pope to go over all the antiquated stories which he is enabled to collect from the pamphlets of such men as Gideon Ousley, and to bring forward such new-lights as authorities against the Catholic church? I could have quoted a passage from the Rev. Sydney Smith, worth all the arguments which he could produce, relative to the persecutions which the Catholics suffered from the early reformers; but I have not, throughout this discussion, made any appeal to the feelings of my Catholic auditors, and I shall not do so now.

Mr. Pope talked of St. Teresa, and related some wonderful stories about her long beard. I suppose he would have us conclude, that because St. Teresa was long bearded, the Catholic religion cannot be true. I deny the authority which he has quoted. I refer him to the life of St. Teresa, as given in the Lives of the Saints, by Alban Butler—he will not find recorded there the ridiculous stories which he has retailed to us. He acknowledges that he did not know that there was such a text in the Douay Bible as "No man knoweth whether he be worthy of love or hatred." Did he not tell us that he had carefully compared the two translations, and did he not describe the Vulgate as *scaturientem erroribus?*

He now acknowledges his ignorance of the existence of this text in the Douay Bible. Now the version given of this text in the Douay Bible differs not materially nor substantially from that given of it in the Protestant translation. It is there rendered

"Man knoweth not love or hatred by all that is before him."

Hear the next verse—

"But all things are kept uncertain for the time to come, because all things equally happen to the just and to the wicked, to the good and to the evil, to the clean and to the unclean," &c.

There is I contend in these passages, no material differences between the Protestant version and the Douay Bible. Mr. Pope has showed his ignorance of the solemn expression always used by a general council in defining articles of faith, and he confounds with it the formula of an excommunication. When an article of faith is declared by a general council, it is solemnly decreed, "Si quis dixerit; if any one shall contradict this anathema sit." But where that formulary is not employed, and the mere excommunication pronounced, it does not regard matters of faith. Had Mr. Pope consulted Delahogue, with whose work he pretends to be so intimately acquainted, he would find the phrase, *si quis dixerit*, is never employed by a general council, but when an article of faith is defined. I should be sorry that any personal differences should exist between me and my friend, Mr. Pope. I declare that I have no feelings towards him, but those of a Christian, a brother, and a gentleman; and that I shall never hear him spoken of disrespectfully without defending his character. I trust that I shall never entertain any other towards him. I will say, and it is as far as I can go, that no man ever maintained his opinions more ingeniously, or set up a more plausible defence. It was to me a cause of regret that the interrogatory system had not been adopted in this discussion, as I would then have had an opportunity of taking Mr. Pope's arguments *seriatim*, point by point, and of unravelling his sophisms. Mr. Pope talked of the Catholic church having fallen into error, and yet he admits that this erroneous church has been suffered to exist for eighteen hundred years. This gentleman really appears to have acquired more confidence after his six or seven years preaching, than the whole Catholic church for eighteen hundred years. It has long been the custom of the reformers, and of those who were gifted with internal illumination. to talk of the scarlet lady, seated upon the seven hills. How could a church have thus subsisted for eighteen centuries, if error had formed its corner stone and foundation? Have we ever read or heard of any system either in politics, or in religion, lasting for such a period of time, unless it was founded upon the best principles?

I may now mention that I put seven queries to Mr. Pope to any one of which he has not returned even the semblance of an answer. I asked him why he believed that all truths are contained in the scripture; I then inquired from him by what authority the sign of the cross was employed in baptism? I

asked him why he used blood—though, indeed, he had endeavoured to draw a distinction between the red gravy which flows from a shoulder of mutton, and the blood—(of the particles of which that gravy is most unquestionably composed.) I confess myself unable to understand his metaphysical distinction. Perhaps he goes upon the maxim that *odia sunt restringenda.* I called upon him to show why he did not wash the feet of his neighbours; Peter, we know, said to Christ: "Lord, thou shalt not wash my feet"—our Saviour replied: "If I wash thee not, thou shalt have no part with me." I called upon Mr. Pope to prove the procession of the Holy Ghost, from the scripture? I called upon him to show where the term "*consubstantial*" was employed in scripture? I called upon him to show where the baptism of infants was authorized by scripture. I demanded an answer to these several queries. He has certainly evaded them. Judge, candid and enlightened Protestants, if he has quoted as many texts of scripture as I have. There is not an article of my belief in support of which I did not adduce clear and most manifest texts of scripture. Has Mr. Pope done so? He has quoted some texts of scripture against me, but not one to establish his *own rule of faith.* He thought proper to substitute for the word of God, the fallible interpretation of man—to appeal from the direct evidence of scripture, to the obscure and glimmering light of private judgment. Beware of following such an *ignis fatuus*, when the meridian sun is before you—it will lead you into marshes and the habitations of error—it will never conduct you to the fountain of truth. I have quoted the opinions of the holy Fathers, and I am bold to say, that I prefer their opinions to the single opinion of Mr. Pope. I have read to you the opinion of St. Augustin, who declares that he "would not believe the four gospels if the authority of the Catholic church did not move him thereto. This recalls to my mind the saying of St. Cyprian, that he has not God for his Father who has not the Church for his mother. This Mr. Pope asserts was applied to Pope Stephen. The work of Cyprian lies here on the table, and I challenge Mr. Pope to read twenty lines of the page in which this passage occurs, and then to maintain his opinion as before. The passage of St. Cyprian has been misrepresented by my friend. Again, I called upon him to answer the objections of the Socinian, without manifestly contradicting the principles of private judgment. Reason is on the side of the Socinian; and mysteries being *above reason*, he has a better right to exercise his private judgment than Mr. Pope, of which be it observed, Mr. Pope cannot claim a monopoly. I would answer the Socinian by the authority of a church which has existed for eighteen hundred years. If he would not believe in that authority, I, at

all events, would not contradict myself, as I would not concede to him the right of private judgment. Not so Mr. Pope. The very fact of his pressing his interpretation upon the Socinian contradicts the principles of private judgment, as he thus endeavours to make a monopoly of that which he himself describes as the gift of heaven.

I defied Mr. Pope to show how a Protestant according to his principles could make an act of faith. He has not done so. I admit the exercise of private judgment in discovering the marks of the true church, but the moment the inquirer has made that discovery, that instant all difficulties are cleared away—all objections vanish—and he is enabled to laugh to scorn the quibbles of the Atheist, the Deist, and the unbeliever. Talk of internal evidence, indeed—why you might as well tell the Pagan that 2 and 2 make 6—he can never make the discovery. I never could make the discovery. Millions upon millions of Christians have lived and died without ever discovering this internal illumination of which Mr. Pope has so confidently spoken. The Catholic church rejects this *ignus fatuus*, and with equal justice and wisdom she discards and condemns the principle of private judgment. According to that principle, as I have already shown, it would be impossible to establish by clear and unexceptionable argument, the *authority*, the *integrity*, and the *inspiration* of the *sacred scriptures*.

Here the Discussion ended. When Mr. Maguire had taken his seat Mr. Pope rose and shook him by the hand, which was cordially returned by Mr. Maguire.

Mr. Pope then stated to the meeting, that he had that moment been informed by Admiral Oliver that the notes and suggestions of which he, Mr. Pope, had spoken, though taken down, had not been seen by Mr. Maguire.

Counsellor Clinch declined to give an opinion touching the word ἀφεστ.

Mr. Pope added to the Report this note;—"I beg to say, in reference to the statement concerning Stephen, that Cyprian strongly reprehends him as 'endeavouring to assert the cause of heretics against the church of God,' but applies the words 'he has not God,' &c. to the heretics of whom he speaks, and not to him. Cyprian.—Oper. Ep. 74. ad Pompeium. Oxford, 1682.

"RICHARD T. P. POPE."

Mr. Maguire added the following:—"In the description of the council of Basil, the Arians who disturbed the council of Rimini, are mentioned through mistake. T. MAGUIRE."

THE END.

PUBLICATIONS OF P. J KENEDY,

EXCELSIOR

Catholic Publishing House,

5 BARCLAY ST., Near Broadway,

Opposite the Astor House, NEW YORK.

All for the Sacred Heart of Jesus. Dedicated to associates of League of Sacred Heart Net.	50
Adelmar the Templar, a Tale of the Crusades	.40
Adventures and Daring Deeds of Michael Dwyer	1.00
All about Knock. Complete account of Cures, etc	1.00
Apparitions and Miracles at Knock, paper cover	.25
Atala. By Chateaubriand. Doré's Illustrations, 4to gilt.	3.00
Battle of Ventry Harbor, paper cover	.20
Bible, Douay. Octavo, large print. Vellum cloth	2.50
The same, American Morocco, gilt edges	5.00
The same, Turkey Morocco, antique, gilt edges	10.00
Bible, Haydock's, Style G.Fr. Morocco paneled, 2 clasps.	18.00
The same, Style H., Turkey Morocco beveled	25.00
Blanche, or the great evils of Pride	.40
Blind Agnese, Little Spouse of the Blessed Sacrament.	.60
British Catholic Poets, red line, gilt edges	.25
Brooks (Senator) and Hughes (Archbishop) Controversy.	.75
Burke's Lectures and Sermons 1st series, cloth	2.00
The same, full gilt side and edges	3.00
Burke's Lectures and Sermons, 2d series cloth	2.00
The same, full gilt side and edges	3.00
Burke's Lectures and Sermons in Ireland, cloth	2.50
The same, full gilt side and edges	3.00
Burke's Lectures—The set complete, 3 vols, plain	6.00
The same gilt	9.00
Burke's Reply to Froude, Ireland's case stated	1.00
Cannon's Poems and Dramas. Red line, gilt edges	1.25

Catholic Prayer-Books, 25c., 50c., *up to* **12 00**

☞ Any of above books sent free by mail on receipt of price. Agents wanted everywhere to sell above books, to whom liberal terms will be given. Address

P. J. KENEDY, Excelsior Catholic Publishing House, *5 Barclay Street, New York.*

Publications of P. J. Kenedy, 5 Barclay St. N. Y.

Canon Schmid's Exquisite Tales, 6 vols, Illustrated...	3.00
Cannon's Practical Spelling Book	.25
Captain of the Club, a Story for Boys.....	.75
Carroll O'Donoghue. By Christine Faber.....	1.25
Carpenter's Speller and Definer.....	.25
Catechism Third Plenary Council, large, No. 2, paper.. per 100 net	2.50
The same, abridged No. 1, paper per 100 net.....	1.50
The same, No. 2, cloth flexible, per 100 net.....	5.00
The same, No 1, " " " " "	3.50
Catechism, General, National Council, paper per 100 net.	2.00
The same, abridged paper cover, per 100 net.....	1.50
Catechism, Butler's large, paper per 100 net.....	2.50
The same, abridged, paper per 100 net.....	1.50
The same, cloth, Illustrated Mass Prayers.....	.30
Catechism, The, or Short abridgment, New York, per 100 net.....	2.00
Catechism, Boston. Prayers at Mass, etc., paper per 100 net.....	2.00
Catechism, Keenan's Doctrinal, cloth.....	.50
Catechism, Poor Man's, large and thick.	.40
Catechism, Spanish, Ripalda, paper cover.....	.12
Catechism, Spanish, Astete, paper cover..	.15
Catechism, Spanish, Nuevo Caton, paper cover.....	.15
Catholic Christian Instructed, paper .20, cloth.....	.30
Catholic Excelsior Library, 6 vols, per set.....	4.50
Catholic Faith and Morals, By L'Homond.	1.00
Catholic Fireside Library, 10 vols, per set...	7.50
Catholic Flowers from Protestant Gardens, gilt..	1.25
Catholic Home Library, 8 vols, per set.....	4.00
Catholic Juvenile Library, 6 vols, per set.....	2.40
Catholic Keepsake Library, 6 vols, per set.....	4.50
Catholic Missions and Missionaries. By Shea...	2.50
Catholic Offering or Gift Book. By Abp. Walsh	1.00
Catholic Piety, (Prayer Book). Prices range upwards from...	.60
Catholic School Book.....	.25
Chambers' English Literature, 2 vols, Octavo.....	5.00

Catholic Prayer-Books, 25c., 50c., *up to* **12 00**

☞ Any of above books sent free by mail on receipt of price. Agents wanted everywhere to sell above books, to whom liberal terms will be given. Address

P. J. KENEDY, Excelsior Catholic Publishing House, *5 Barclay Street, New York.*

Publications of P. J. Kenedy, 5 Barclay St. N. Y.

Chancellor and his Daughter. Sir Thos. More	1.25
Christian Etiquette. For Ladies and Gentlemen	1.25
Christian Maiden's Love. By Louis Veuillot.	.75
Christian's Rule of Life. By St. Liguori	.50
Christian Virtues. By St. Liguori	1.00
Christopher Columbus. Illustrated, 4to gilt	3.00
Chivalrous Deed. By Christine Faber	1.25
Clifton Tracts. Library of Controversy, 4 vols	3.00
Collins' Poems. Red line, gilt edge	1.25
Converted Jew. M. A. Ratisbonne	.50
Countess of Glosswood	.75
Crown of Jesus (Prayer Book). Prices range upwards from	1.00
Daily Companion (Prayer Book). Prices upwards from	.25
Daily Piety, (Prayer Book). Prices upwards from	.30
Dalaradia. By William Collins	.75
Davis' Poems and Essays, complete	1.50
Devout Manual, 18mo, (Prayer Book). Prices upwards from	.75
Devout Manual, 32mo, (Prayer Book). Prices upwards from	.35
Dick Massey, a Story of Irish Evictions	1.00
Diploma of Children of Mary Society, per 100 net	8.00
Doctrinal Catechism. By Rev. Stephen Keenan	.50
Dove of the Tabernacle. By Rev. T. H. Kinane	.75
Drops of Honey. By Father Zelus Animarum	.75
Drops of Honey Library—9 volumes, per set	6.75
Elevation of the soul to God	.75
Empire and Papacy. The Money God	1.25
Epistles and Gospels, 24mo. Good Type	.20
Erin go Bragh. Songster. Paper cover	.25
Evenings at School. New edition Net	1.00
Exercises of the Way of the Cross, paper cover	.05
Faber's (Christine) Works, 4 vols, large, 12mo. per set.	5.00
Fair France during the Second Empire	1.00
Fair Maid of Connaught. By Mrs. Hughes	.75
Faugh a Ballagh Songster. Paper cover	.25
Feasts and Fasts. By Rev. Alban Butler.	1.25

Catholic Prayer-Books, 25c., 50c., *up to* **12 00**

☞ Any of above books sent free by mail on receipt of price. Agents wanted everywhere to sell above books, to whom liberal terms will be given. Address

P. J. KENEDY, Excelsior Catholic Publishing House, ***5 Barclay Street, New York.***

Publications of P. J. Kenedy, 5 Barclay St. N. Y.

Feast of Flowers and The Stoneleighs	.75
Fifty Reasons why the R. C. Religion, etc.	25
Flowers of Piety (Prayer Book). Prices upwards from.	.35
Following of Christ. A Kempis, 1.25, 1.00 and	.40
Foster Sisters. By Agnes M. Stewart	1.25
From Error to Truth, or the Deacon's Daughters	.75
Furniss' Tracts for Spiritual Reading	1.00
Gems of Prayer, (Prayer Book). Prices upwards from.	.25
Glimpse of Glory and other Poems. E. C. Kane	.50
Glories of Mary. By St. Liguori. Large, 12mo	1.25
Golden Book of the Confraternities	.50
Golden Hour Library, 6 vols, red edges. per set	3.00
Good Reading For Young Girls	.75
Gordon Lodge, or Retribution	1.25
Grace O'Halloran. By Agnes M. Stewart	.75
Green Shores of Erin. Drama, net	.25
Grounds of the Catholic Doctrine	.25
Guardian's Mystery. By Christine Faber	1.25
Handy An[illegible] By Lover. Large edition	1.25
Hay on Miracles. Explanation, etc.	1.00
History of the Catholic Church in the U. S. J. G. Shea.	2.00
History of Ireland. By Moore, 2 volumes	3.00
History of Modern Europe. By J. G. Shea	1.25
History of the United States. By Frost	1.25
Hours with the Sacred Heart	.50
Irish Fireside Library, 6 vols, 16mo	6.00
Irish Fireside Stories, Tales and Legends	1.25
Irish National Songster. Comic and Sentimental	1.00
Irish Patriot's Library, 6 vols, 12mo	7.50
Irish Race in the Past and Present	2.50
Irish Rebels in English Prisons	1.50
Irish Scholars of the Penal Days	1.00
Jesus in the Tabernacle. New Meditations	.50
Keenan's Doctrinal Catechism	.50
Keeper of the Lazaretto. By Souvestre	.40
Key of Heaven, 18mo, (Prayer Book). Large. Prices up from	.75

Catholic Prayer-Books, 25c., 50c., *up to* **12 00**

☞ Any of above books sent free by mail on receipt of price. Agents wanted everywhere to sell above books, to whom liberal terms will be given. Address

P. J. KENEDY, Excelsior Catholic Publishing House, *5 Barclay Street, New York.*

Publications of P. J. Kenedy, 5 Barclay St. N. Y.

Key of Heaven, 24mo, (Prayer Book). Medium. Prices up from	.60
Key of Heaven, 32mo, (Prayer Book) Small. Prices up from	.50
Kirwan Unmasked. Paper cover. By Abp. Hughes	.12
La Fontaine's Fables. Red line, gilt edge	1.25
Last of the Catholic O'Malleys	.75
L'Ange Conducteur, (French Prayer Book)	.75
Latin Classics, Expurgated. Volume 1. Net.	.40
Latin Classics, Expurgated. Volume 2. Net	.50
Legends and Fairy Tales of Ireland	2.00
Library of American Catholic History, 3 vols. set	6.00
Library of Catholic Novels, 6 vols per set	7.50
Library of Catholic Stories, 6 vols "	7.50
Library of Controversy. Clifton Tracts, 4 vols "	3.00
Life of Archbishop Mac Hale. Paper .25, Cloth gilt	1.00
Life of Christ. By St. Bonaventure	1.25
The same, gilt edges	1.50
Life of Pope Pius IX. By Monsignor B. O'Reilly	2.50
Life of Robert Emmett. By Madden	1.50
Life of St. Bridget. Paper cover	.10
Life of St. Ignatius, 2 vols. By Bartoli	3.00
Life of St. Liguori. By Mullock	.50
Life of St. Louis, King of France	.40
Life of St. Mary of Egypt	.60
Life of St. Patrick. By O'Leary, 16mo	1.00
Life of St. Winefride, 18mo. Cloth	.60
Life Stories of Dying Penitents	.75
Lily of Israel, Life of the Blessed Virgin Mary	.75
Little Flowers of Piety, (Prayer Book), 1.75-1.25 and	.75
Little Follower of Jesus. By Rev. A. M. Grussi	.75
Little Lace Maker or Eva O'Beirne	.75
Little Lives of the Great Saints. By John O'Kane Murray	1.00
Little Man'l Bl. Trinity, (Prayer Book). Prices up from	.75
Little Office of the Immaculate Conception. Per 100 net	2.50
Lives of St. Ignatius and his Companions	.75

Catholic Prayer-Books, 25c., 50., *up to* **12 00**

☞ Any of above books sent free by mail on receipt of price. Agents wanted everywhere to sell above books, to whom liberal terms will be given. Address

P. J. KENEDY. Excelsior Catholic Publishing House, ***5 Barclay Street, New York.***

Publications of P. J. Kenedy, 5 Barclay St. N. Y.

Lives of the Japanese Martyrs. Spinola, etc	.75
Louisa Kirkbride. By Rev. A. J. Thèbaud, S. J	1.50
Love of Christ. By St. Liguori	.50
Maidens of Hallowed Names. By Rev. Chas. Piccirillo, S. J.	1.00
Maltese Cross and a Painting and its Mission	.40
Manual of the Bl. Trinity, (Prayer Book). Prices upwards from	1.00
Manual of Catholic Prayers. (Prayer Book). Prices upwards from	.37
Manual of the Children of Mary. 448 pages	.50
The same, for Pupils of the Sacred Heart	.25
Manual of the Crucifixion, (Prayer Book). Prices upwards from	.63
May Brooke. By Anna H. Dorsey. New edition	1.25
Meditations on the Incarnation. St. Liguori	.75
Merchant of Antwerp. By Hendrik Conscience	1.25
Mirror of True Womanhood. By Rev. B. O'Reilly	2.50
The same, gilt side and edges	3.00
"Mirror" and "True Men"—2 vols in one, gilt	3.50
Mission Book, 18mo, (Prayer Book). Prices upwards from	75
Mission Book, 24mo, (Prayer Book). Prices upwards from	.50
Mission Cross and Convent at St. Mary's	.75
Mission and Duties of Young Women. By Rev. C. I. White, D.D.	.60
Monsieur le Curé. Drama. Net	.25
Month of Mary. By D. Roberto	.50
Moore's Poetical Works, Complete. Octavo, gilt	3.00
Mother Goose Melodies. For Children	.20
Mother's Sacrifice. By Christine Faber	1.25
Mysteries of the Living Rosary. Per hundred Net	2.50
Nannette's Marriage. Translated from the French	.75
Nelligan's Speeches and Writings	1.25
New Ireland By A. M. Sullivan	1.25

Catholic Prayer-Books, 25c., 50c., *up to* **12 00**

☞ Any of above books sent free by mail on receipt of price. Agents wanted everywhere to sell above books, to whom liberal terms will be given. Address

P. J. KENEDY, Excelsior Catholic Publishing House, *5 Barclay Street, New York.*

Publications of P. J. Kenedy, 5 Barclay St. N. Y.

New Seraphic Manual, (Prayer Book). For use of members of third order St. Francis. Cloth, red edge	.75
New Testament, 18mo. Small edition, good type	.50
New Testament, Octavo. Large type, vellum cloth	1.50
New Testament in Spanish. El Nuevo Testamento	1.50
Nobleman of '89. By M. A. Quinton	1.50
Oramaika. A Catholic Indian Story	.75
Our Country, History of the U. S. By John G. Shea	.50
Pastor's Visit to the Science of Salvation	.60
Pearl in Dark Waters	.75
Pocket Key of Heaven, (Prayer Book). Prices range upwards from	.25
Poor Man's Catechism. By Rev. Mannock, O. S. B.	.40
Prairie Boy. A Story for Boys	.75
Prayer, the Great Means of Salvation. By St. Liguori.	.50
Priests' Blessing, or Destiny	1.25
Procter's Poems. Red line, gilt edge	1.25
Procter's Poems. Presentation edition. Octavo	4.00
Purgatory Opened. Month of November	40
Queen's Confession. By Raoul de Navery	.75
Religion and Science. By Father Ronayne, S. J.	1.25
Rival Mail Carriers. Drama. Net	.25
Rodriguez. Christian Perfection, 3 vols	4.00
Rome, its Churches, Charities and Schools	1.00
Rosario, a Tale of the Sixteenth Century	.75
Rosary Book. Illustrated. Paper Cover	.10
Rose of St. Germains, or Florence O'Neill	1.25
Rose of Venice. A Story of Hatred and Remorse	.75
Sacred History. By Bishop Challoner	.50
Scapular Book, approved by Abp. of New York	.10
Seraphic Staff—3d Order St. Francis	.25
Seven of Us. Stories for Boys and Girls	.75
Silvia, a Drama by John Savage. Net	.90
Sixteen Names of Ancient Ireland. O'Leary	.50
Solitary Island. By Rev. John Talbot Smith	1.25
Sophie's Troubles. By Comtesse de Segur	.75
Southern Catholic Story. Minnie Mary Lee	1.25

Catholic Prayer-Books, 25c., 50c., *up to* **12 00**

☞ Any of above books sent free by mail on receipt of price. Agents wanted everywhere to sell above books, to whom liberal terms will be given. Address

P. J. KENEDY, Excelsior Catholic Publishing House, *5 Barclay Street, New York*

Publications of P. J. Kenedy, 5 Barclay St. N. Y.

Speeches from the Dock, Emmett, Wolfe Tone, etc	1.25
Spirit of St. Liguori. Visits to Blessed Sacrament	.75
St. John's Manual, (Prayer Book). Prices upwards from	1.50
Stations of the Cross. By Rev. G. J. Misdziol. Paper.	.10
Stories for Catholic Children. Rev. Grussi	1.00
Story of Italy, or Lionello. By Bresciani	1.25
Strayed from the Fold. Minnie Mary Lee	1.25
Sunday School Teacher's Class Book. Per doz. net	1.20
Sybil, a Drama. By John Savage. Net	.50
Sure Way to find out the True Religion. Rev. Baddeley.	.25
Tales of Flemish Life. By Hendrik Conscience	1.25
Talks about Ireland. By James Redpath. Paper	.30
Think Well On't. By Bishop Challoner	.40
Three Kings of Cologne. Rev. Titus Joslin	.30
Tracts for the Young—1st and 2d Series. Each	.50
True Men as we need Them. Rev. B. O'Reilly	2.50
Turf Fire Stories and Fairy Tales of Ireland	1.25
Two Cottages. By Lady Fullerton	.50
Two Brides. By Rev. Bernard O'Reilly	1.50
Universal Irish Songster. Profusely Illustrated	1.50
Ursuline Manual, (Prayer Book). Prices upwards from.	.75
Vision of Old Andrew the Weaver	.50
Visits to the Blessed Sacrament. Red edges	.50
Vultures of Erin. A Tale of the Penal Laws	1.25
Waiting for the Train. Drama. Net	.25
Western Missions and Missionaries. De Smet	2.00
Wild Irish Girl. Lady Morgan	1.00
Willy Reilly. Large edition. 12 full page illustrations.	1.25
Within and Without the Fold	1.25
Year with the Saints, 12mo. Red edges. Net	1 50
Young Captives. St. Augustine, etc	.40
Young Poachers. Drama. Net	.25
Youth's Director. Familiar Instructions	.50
Zozimus Papers. Blind Story Teller of Dublin	.75

Catholic Prayer-Books, 25c., 50c., *up to* **12 00**

☞ Any of above books sent free by mail on receipt of price. Agents wanted everywhere to sell above books, to whom liberal terms will be given. Address

P J. KENEDY, Excelsior Catholic Publishing House, *5 Barclay Street, New York.*

page 20
page 123
206
214
220
266

11977

218
Mc 179

AUTHOR MAGUIRE, T.

TITLE Celebrated Controversial Discussion

DATE LOANED	BORROWER'S NAME	ROOM NUMBER
	STORAGE - CBPL	

11977